DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 661 FL 002 748

AUTHOR Lesley, Tay
TITLE Bilingual Education in California.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 132p.; Master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingualism; Community Involvement; Curriculum; Educational Objectives; *English (Second Language); Federal Aid; Instructional Materials; *Language Programs; Masters Theses; *Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Parent Participation; Spanish Speaking; Tables (Data); Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; Teachers; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the development of bilingual education in California along with the impact of federal legislation and seeks to evolve a descriptive definition of term "bilingual education" in terms of programs for Mexican Americans in the state. Bilingual programs in the United States and typologies for bilingual programs are discussed for background information. The author considers 23 of the 26 bilingual programs in California on the basis of objectives, participants, curriculum, methods and materials, teachers and teacher training, and community involvement. In light of his findings, the author presents a classification of current programs and discusses implications for further investigations. A list of references is included along with the questionnaire used in the survey of current programs and the questions used in interviews with program directors. A list of state programs, their directors, and locations is provided. (VM)

ED057661

FL
N-A1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Bilingual Education in California

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language

by

Tay Lesley

Thesis Committee:

Professor Clifford H. Prator, Chairman

Professor Robert D. Wilson

Professor John D. McNeil

1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FL002748

The thesis of Tay Lesley is approved.

Robert D. Wilson

Robert D. Wilson

John D. McNeil

John D. McNeil

Clifford H. Prator

Clifford H. Prator, Committee Chairman

University of California, Los Angeles

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables..... v

Acknowledgments..... vi

Abstract.....vii

I. Introduction

I.1. What Is Bilingual Education?..... 1

I.2. Purpose and Limitations of the Study..... 6

I.3. Research Procedure..... 7

II. Background of the Study

II.1. Bilingual Programs in the U.S. 9

II.2. Typologies of Bilingual Programs..... 20

III. The Development of Bilingual Education in California

III.1. The Problem:
Educating the Mexican-American..... 27

III.2. The Impact of Federal Legislation..... 34

III.3. The Trend Toward Bilingual Education..... 42

III.4. Summary..... 52

IV. Title VII Programs in California

IV.1. Objectives..... 54

IV.2. Participants..... 61

IV.3. Curriculum..... 67

IV.4. Methods and Materials..... 75

IV.5. Teachers and Teacher Training..... 83

IV.6. Community Involvement..... 90

IV.7. Summary..... 94

V. Conclusions

V.1. General Conclusions..... 97

V.2. Classifying Current Programs.....100

V.3. Implications of the Study.....107

List of References.....111

Appendixes.....115

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Objectives.....56

Table 2: Participants.....63

Table 3: Curriculum.....68

Table 4: Teachers and Teacher Training.....85

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to express his sincere gratitude to the members of his committee--particularly to Professor Prator--for their enccuragement and assistance in carrying out this project, as well as to the project directors, teachers, and other persons invclved in current Title VII programs who provided much of the information on which this study is based.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS

Bilingual Education in California

by

Tay Lesley

Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language

University of California, Los Angeles, 1971

Professor Clifford H. Prator, Chairman

This study attempts to deal with the current confusion over the expression "bilingual education" and to construct a practical definition of the term based on an examination of bilingual programs in a limited geographical area. The context chosen is California, and the study focuses on both the historical and actual aspects of the question. The historical, or dichronic aspect involves an examination of the origins of bilingual education in California and the evolution in state policy of a trend favoring bilingual education. The actual, or synchronic aspect concerns a study of current programs developed under the Bilingual Education Act and an attempt to classify these according to certain well-defined types.

The study is developed in the following steps:

1) an opening section (comprising Chapters I and II) introduces the problem and provides the necessary background to the study;

2) Chapter III treats the historical development of bilingual education in the state;

3) Chapter IV compares current bilingual programs under a variety of categories;

4) a final chapter is devoted to conclusions concerning the study of earlier and current programs, as well as to the discussion of a typology.

I. Introduction

I.1. What Is Bilingual Education?

Of all the problems that surround the study of bilingualism, few have been as vexing or persistent as those of definition. Such terms as "bilingual," "bilingualism," or "bilingual education" may at first glance appear fairly straightforward and easily interpreted. A "bilingual," one may think, is a person who knows two languages; "bilingualism" refers to the same capacity in an individual or a society; and "bilingual education" pertains to the use of two languages in an educational system. Upon closer inspection, however, the meaning of these words becomes extremely elusive. In order to be classified as bilingual, for example, must a person have approximately equal facility in both languages, or is a minimal proficiency in the second language enough? Should a definition of bilingualism emphasize the knowledge of a language (e.g. Haugen, 1956), or the ability of a speaker to actually use the languages he knows (e.g. Weinreich, 1953)? And is it correct to label as bilingual a country like Belgium, where two largely monolingual language groups (French and Flemish) exist side by side; or must one reserve the term for a country such as Paraguay that contains a high proportion of native bilingual (Spanish and Guarani) speakers?

The confusion becomes particularly acute over the definition of "bilingual education." The reason for this

is that bilingual education has been used to refer to so many different educational systems at different times and places that it has been rendered almost meaningless. Commenting on the use of the expression "bilingual school" in various parts of the world, William F. Mackey says:

> Schools in the United Kingdom where half of the school-subjects are taught in English are bilingual schools. Schools in Canada in which all subjects are taught in English to French-Canadians are called bilingual schools. Schools in the Soviet Union in which all subjects except Russian are taught in English are bilingual schools, as are schools in which some of the subjects are taught in Georgian and the rest in Russian (1970, p. 64).

Mackey concludes that there is little use in attempting to define bilingual education, since no single definition could adequately describe the multitude of situations involved. What is needed is rather a system of classification that would take all the types of bilingual education into account. (For a description of Mackey's typology of bilingual programs, see II.2, pp. 20-22.)

Within the United States itself, bilingual education has also been subject to a wide variety of interpretations. In the continuation of the above quotation, Mackey states: "Schools in the United States where English is taught as a second language are called bilingual schools, as are parochial schools and even week-end schools" (Ibid.). We find that here, as in other countries, the expression "bilingual education" has sometimes been used to refer simply to the education of non-English speaking or "bilingual" children, whether or not the curriculum or type of instruction is

actually bilingual. A recent doctoral dissertation with the title Bilingual Education in Certain Southwest School Districts, for example, discusses the educational status and problems of Spanish-speaking children who are following the normal English curricula in public schools of the Southwest (Baca, 1956). A particular problem in this country has been the widespread misunderstanding over the differences between English as a Second Language and bilingual programs. Addressing himself to this point, Theodore Andersson remarks:

> Bilingual education has often been confused with the teaching of English as a second language (ESL). . . . Many a proponent of ESL still considers English the only proper medium of instruction, whereas the advocate of bilingual schooling considers that the mother tongue is the best initial medium of instruction, to be combined with the learning of English as a second language (1969, p. 37).

Lately, however, there appears to be a growing consensus over what "bilingual education" really means, or at least, what it should mean. The current feeling seems to be that bilingual education must provide for the use of two languages in teaching the regular subject-matter of the curriculum. In the words of Saville and Troike, "Bilingual education is not just 'education for bilinguals,' nor is it merely an English as a Second Language program, although ESL is a necessary part. It is an educational program in which two languages are mediums of instruction" (1970, p. 2). Somewhat more specifically, Miles V. Zintz describes the bilingual school as follows:

> A bilingual school is one in which instruction during the school day is afforded in more than one language. This means that content subjects will be taught in both languages. [For example,] one might study his mathematics in English and his history lesson in Spanish in a Spanish-English bilingual school (1970, p. 41).

Other authors, while affirming that bilingual education entails the use of two languages in the curriculum, stress the educational development of the non-English speaking child in his native tongue. According to Armando Rodriguez, "Bilingual education means the opportunity to teach the child educational concepts in all phases of the curriculum in his mother tongue while he is learning English" (1969, p. 4). In any case, the current interpretation of bilingual education clearly excludes strictly ESL programs as well as all regular foreign language teaching in our elementary and high schools. Perhaps the most concise description of bilingual education to be found in the recent literature is offered by A. Bruce Gaarder: "A bilingual school is a school which uses, concurrently, two languages as mediums of instruction in any portion of the curriculum except the languages themselves" (1967, p. 110).

The adoption of the Bilingual Education Act of 1967 (ESEA Title VII) affected the discussion over bilingual education in two ways. First, it was clear that passage of the act would not have been possible without a dramatic shift in public opinion in favor of the concept of bilingual education. In Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Andersson and Boyer state: "Twelve years ago there was no-

where in the country any perceptible interest in organizing bilingual programs in public schools" (1970, p. 20). Now that a nationwide program to promote bilingual projects has been written into law, it becomes important to ask: What caused this remarkable shift in public attitude, and what events led up to the adoption of the BEA? On the other hand, while the BEA lent support to the interpretation of bilingual education as "instruction in two languages," passage of the Act did not end the debate over the issue of definition. As defined by the Act, bilingual education is "the use of two languages, one of which is English, as mediums of instruction." This definition is so broad, however, that schools having only one subject-matter course in any language other than English would qualify for funding. Therefore, in order to determine more precisely the meaning of bilingual education under the BEA, it is necessary to examine the types of programs actually established under the Act.

I.2. Purpose and Limitations of the Study

The overall purpose of this study is to investigate the development of bilingual education in a limited American context--in this case the state of California--in order to evolve a descriptive definition of the term "bilingual education." Beyond the following section, which attempts to provide a background for the local situation by a description of the development of bilingual programs in the U.S., and a discussion of typologies of bilingual education, the study deals with two main aspects. Since an understanding of what bilingual education "means" in the present California context is impossible without a look at the historical background, the first aspect examines the origins of bilingual education in the state and its development up to the passage of the Bilingual Education Act. The second aspect, a study of current Title VII programs, undertakes to survey the present extent and significance of bilingual education in California. This aspect involves a comparative study of these programs and an attempt to classify them into several broad types.

While the second aspect concentrates on a study of current programs, the purpose is description, not evaluation. No attempt is made in this paper to assess the success or failure of certain programs with respect to pupil performance, acceptance by the community, or the like.

I.3. Research Procedure

The background information used in this study was drawn from a variety of sources, particularly from the files of ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center), while the historical treatment of bilingual education in California is based largely upon an analysis of bulletins, monographs, and other publications of the California State Department of Education.

For the study of Title VII programs, the technique used was a combination of survey by questionnaire and in-depth interviewing. The questionnaire (see Appendix B) was designed to reveal basic information about the organization of Title VII programs, and contained questions under the following headings: 1) Participants; 2) Objectives; 3) Curriculum and Materials: 4) Teacher Training; and 5) Community Involvement. Beginning the first week of March, 1970, the questionnaires were mailed along with a cover letter (see Appendix A) to the directors of each of the twenty-six Title VII programs in California. A total of twenty questionnaires were completed and returned. As it happened, two programs that returned questionnaires had received funding as planning rather than operational programs. One of these (Santa Paula) was excluded from the study because of lack of information on the questionnaire. The other (Santa Barbara) was included in spite of its designation as a planning program, because teaching operations had begun

after the first of the year and sufficient data was available to warrant its inclusion among the active programs. This meant that information from the questionnaire was available for nineteen out of the twenty-six programs.

With the purpose of supplementing the information provided by the questionnaire, data was obtained from an examination of bilingual project proposals, and a series of visits was made to the sites of twenty bilingual programs. During the visits to project sites, recorded interviews were conducted with project directors, teachers, or other involved persons (for a list of interview questions; and a description of persons interviewed, locations of interviews, and dates, see Appendixes C and D). Since several programs were visited which did not return the questionnaire, information for the study became available from a total of twenty-three programs.

II. Background of the Study

II.1. Bilingual Programs in the U.S.

In preparation for a study of bilingual education in California, it seems advisable to take a closer look at the evolution of bilingual programs in the United States as a whole. The United States has never been officially declared a bilingual or multilingual nation as have, for example, Canada, Switzerland, or the Union of South Africa. On the other hand, this country has always harbored a large minority of non-English speaking citizens whose presence has presented a continual challenge to the educational system. If one is to believe the popular "melting-pot" theory, all non-English speakers are being assimilated to the predominant language and culture of the society, chiefly by means of the free, English-speaking public school. Following the interpretation of William A. Stewart, one might describe the traditional policy of this country toward bilingualism as "the eventual elimination, by education and decree, of all but one language which remains to serve both official and general purposes" (Andersson and Boyer, 1970, v. 1, p. 41).

However, the historical facts do not fully justify this view. During most of our history, one finds the existence of numerous schools which made extensive use of the native language as well as English in order to further the education of non-English speaking pupils. According to

Andersson and Boyer, the history of public bilingual schooling in the United States can be divided into two parts: pre-World War I and post-1963. In the first period of bilingual schooling, German-English schools flourished throughout the country. Between 1880 and 1917, for example, German was used as a medium of instruction in schools in Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Baltimore, and New Ulm, Minnesota. Besides German, only French in Louisiana and Spanish in New Mexico were used as teaching mediums in public schools; but Norwegian, Czech, Dutch and other immigrant languages were occasionally taught as subjects (Ibid., p. 17). In addition to bilingual programs in public institutions of learning, numerous private (mainly parochial) schools were founded in the same period. Among these were many bilingual parochial schools established around the turn of the century to serve Poles, Lithuanians, Italians, and other Catholics from Eastern and Southern Europe in their native languages. (For an account of the afternoon and week-end schools of these groups, see Chapter 5 in Fishman, 1966.)

The anti-German feeling of the First World War put an end to the learning of German and other languages in our public elementary schools, and it was only very recently that bilingual programs were once more being established on a significant scale. The second period of bilingual schooling can be said to begin in 1963 with the founding of the

bilingual program of the Coral Way School in Miami. This program was adopted in an effort to accomodate the needs of the children of Cuban refugees who were streaming into the Miami area at the rate of some 3,000 a month. With an enrollment of about equal numbers of monolingual English and Spanish speakers, school officials decided to initiate a completely bilingual program in grades one, two, and three, with plans to add a higher grade each year. After a period of initiation into the second language, instruction was given in both languages on an approximately equal basis. In grades one through three all subjects were taught in the vernacular for about half the day, and reinforced in the second language during the second half. In grades four and five it was found that pupils could learn subject matter through the second language without the benefit of re-teaching in the mother tongue. A group of Cuban teachers taught the Spanish part of the curriculum, while native Americans were responsbile for the English component. Most of the classes were segregated, but children from both language backgrounds mingled freely during such activities as physical education, art, music, and supervised play (Anderson and Boyer, 1970, v. 1, p. 18; Gaarder, 1966, pp. 11-15).

The following year, 1964, saw the establishment of two remarkable bilingual projects in the heavily Spanish-speaking area of South Texas. Perhaps the better known is the program of the United Consolidated School District near

Laredo. The United Consolidated program was initially launched in the first three grades at Nye School, and then extended to the other two elementary schools in the district. In the first grades, children are mixed in the classroom without regard to language background or intelligence quotients and spend half their time in English-speaking and half their time in Spanish-speaking activities. All subjects are taught in both English and Spanish by skilled bilingual teachers who randomly interchange languages throughout the day and in each class period. In the higher grades certain subjects are taught in Spanish or in English, depending on the special abilities of the teacher, and the Spanish language is continued as a subject for one class period a day. Originally dubbed a "biliteracy" program, the teaching stresses the development of all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in both Spanish and English. Most of the Spanish materials used in the program are from Mexico (Andersson and Boyer, 1970, v. 1, pp. 18-19; Carter, 1970, pp. 192-198; Gaarder, 1966, pp. 10-11).

In the same year as the founding of the United Consolidated Program, the Language Research Project was begun in the San Antonio Independent School District. This program, directed by Thomas A. Horn of the University of Texas and developed under the auspices of Elizabeth Ott of the Southwest Regional Laboratories, differs from the United Consol-

idated and Dade County programs in its relatively limited emphasis on the use of Spanish. Originally designed as an experiment to teach reading readiness in English to Mexican-American youngsters of disadvantaged backgrounds, the Project was expanded to include a Spanish component and in 1967 was designated as "bilingual." Subjects taught bilingually now include language arts, science, and social studies. The Spanish component is taught by native speakers--either the regular classroom teacher or another who exchanges with the teacher (Carter, 1970, pp. 189-192; Andersson and Boyer, 1970, v. 1, p. 19). The limited nature of the Spanish aspect of the curriculum--some eighty minutes a day--suggests to Andersson and Boyer that "this program is more concerned with the transfer than with maintenance of Spanish as such. Spanish is used essentially to build the self-concept of children and to facilitate their learning of English as the eventually exclusive medium of learning" (Ibid., p. 19).

The next few years witnessed the growth of bilingual programs all over the country. Most were programs in Spanish-English bilingual education. Bilingual programs started in Pecos, New Mexico, and Edinburgh, Texas, in 1965. In the next year similar programs were established in the Harlandale Independent School District of San Antonio; in Del Rio, Texas; Zapata, Texas; in Calexico, California; Marysville, California; and Rough Rock, Arizona.

The following group of programs began in 1967: Las Cruces, New Mexico; Hoboken, New Jersey; Corpus Cristi, Texas; Del Valle, Texas; and St. Croix, Virgin Islands (Ibid.). The culmination of this activity came with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1967. Under the provisions of the Act, seventy-five bilingual programs, some of them pre-existing and others newly developed, were funded for the 1969-70 school year. (For a brief description of these programs, see Ibid., pp. 256-290.)

How can one account for the remarkable rebirth of bilingual education in America after 1963? The phenomenon is not easily explained, but a number of factors appear to have brought about this result. Certainly, by the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century it had become clear that bilingualism was increasingly desirable for the nation. America's greatly expanded role in foreign affaris, involving diplomacy, trade, technical assistance, education, health, and all other aspects of international relations called for large numbers of bilingual-bicultural citizens to represent us in the forums of the world. Unfortunately, it appeared that the policies of acculturation and assimilation had proceeded so far as to threaten the very existence of our "natural" bilinguals--immigrants and the descendants of immigrants who grow up speaking their native languages. As a consequence people began to think more in terms of preserving these natural language resources,

by education or other means. Joshua Fishman sums up this change in attitude as follows:

> After many generations of neglect and apathy, American speakers of non-English languages have, of late, become objects of more positive attention than has commonly been their lot in most American communities. They are now more frequently viewed as commanding a rare commodity, a skill which has suddenly become a valuable asset for the country (1966, p. 319).

Another powerful influence contributing to the rise of bilingual education was the growing recognition of the special educational needs of Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest. Since the conquest of the Southwest by English-speaking Americans in 1848, Spanish-speakers in the states of Arizona, California, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado had been subject to various kinds of discriminatory treatment. Lawrence B. Glick asserts that: "many communities [in the Southwest]. . . enforced the segregation of this group in schools and in housing, restricted their level of employment, and prohibited their participation in public affairs such as service on juries and police forces" (1969, p. 95). In the first two decades of this century, concern for the education of the Mexican-American was minimal. According to Thomas P. Carter, "Educators shared society's view of the Mexican-American as an outsider, one who was never expected to participate fully in American life" (1970, p. 9). Mexican-Americans were held to innately inferior in intelligence, which in turn was thought to justify placing them in segregated schools. Since many Mexican-American

children were attached to families of roaming farm workers, no attempt was made to develop long-range programs for these children, and in some districts they were even discouraged from attending school at all (Ibid., p. 68).

However, by the 1930's one finds evidence of an increasing public concern for the education of the Mexican-American. Beginning in this period, and especially in the years following World War II, numerous teachers' conferences and workshops were held to discuss the special educational problems of Mexican-American students. Typical of such meetings was the First Regional Conference on the Education of the Spanish-Speaking People in the Southwest, held in Austin, Texas, in 1946. The conference called attention to the poor attendance and low academic achievement of Mexican-Americans, and asked for such changes as an end to segregation, improved teacher training, the development of better methods for teaching English, and improvement in school physical facilities. In the 1950's and 1960's the civil rights movement brought a heightened awareness of the plight of the Mexican-American and the tendency to view his problems as characteristic of low socio-economic status (Carter, 1970, pp. 12-13). An important step toward the broadened recognition of the educational deficiencies of this group came with an analysis of the 1960 census, which showed that the Spanish-surnamed student in the five Southwestern states fell an average of 4.0 years in educa-

tional attainment behind his Anglo counterpart in the age group of 14 years or older (Rodriguez, 1969, p. 8). Then in 1966, the National Education Association (NEA) issued a booklet entitled The Invisible Minority which declared that "the most acute educational problem in the Southwest is that which involves Mexican-American children" (p. 1), and went on to recommend bilingual education as a means to alleviating this problem.

The NEA pamphlet first dwells on the differences and special problems of Mexican-American children. The alienation of these children in the school is traced to the alienation of the Spanish-speaking within the larger society. Restricted by their poverty and clinging steadfastly to their inherited language and culture, Spanish speakers have become "outsiders" in their own land--an "invisible minority." Thus when the Spanish-speaking child comes to school, he faces a new and threatening environment. The language of instruction is English, which the child may have little or no acquaintance with. The child's difficulty in acquiring English is complicated by the fact that he lacks many of the concepts and experiences familiar to most middle-class Anglo children (National Education Association, 1966, p. 8). The total immersion in English has other effects. Until recently, many school districts in the Southwest, especially those with high enrollments of Mexican-American children, forbade the speaking of Spanish either

in the classroom or on the playground. The psychological harm done to the Spanish-speaking child is described as follows: "In telling him that he must not speak his native language, we are saying to him by implication that Spanish and the culture which it represents are of no worth. Therefor (it follows) he is of no worth. The child develops an inferiority complex" (Ibid., p. 11). The result of these problems is educational retardation and a high drop-out rate among Mexican-American children, as documented in the figures of the Lindsay Report, Herschel T. Manuel's Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest, and other sources.

The NEA report then describes a number of experimental projects in bilingual education in order to point out some of the more constructive approaches to the problems of Spanish-speaking children. Based of its observations of bilingual programs in various parts of the Southwest, the report comes to the following conclusion:

> The Laredo program and other similar programs that we observed in our Survey--plus our own experiences and independent studies--have persuaded us beyond any doubt of the validity of bilingualism. . . . It can be a tool--indeed the most important tool--with which to educate and motivate the Mexican-American child. It can be the means by which he achieves an affirmative self-concept--by which he comes to know who and what he is, takes pride in his heritage and culture, and develops a sense of his own worth (Ibid., p. 17).

Finally, the report makes a weries of recommendations for desirable programs for Mexican-Americans. Some of the recommendations include the following: 1) bilingual (Spanish-English) instruction in the early years and contin-

uing through high school; 2) teaching of English as a second language; 3) emphasis on literary skills in Spanish; 4) courses which help the Mexican-American children develop a pride in their culture and language; 5) use of bilingual teachers and teacher aides. Still, the report takes pains to underline the fact that programs must differ according to the geographical location and the make-up of the students. For example, it is noted that a program for Spanish-speaking students in Colorado who have had little or no formal training in Spanish would have to differ radically from a program provided for recent immigrants from Spanish-speaking countries who have acquired a high level of literacy in their native language (Ibid., pp. 17-18, 26).

The NEA report was followed by a series of conferences and actions which recommended bilingual education as the appropriate path to improve the educational status of Mexican-Americans. As noted, most of the programs initiated in the second period of bilingual education were Spanish-English programs; and by far the largest percentage of these were aimed at Mexican-American children in the Southwest. In 1967 Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, author of S.428, a bill designed to develop bilingual programs for Spanish-speakers, could argue that: "If it were not for the Mexican-American problem, you would not have bilingual education. The fact that we have millions and millions of Mexicans makes that a national problem" (U.S. Senate, 1967, p. 479).

II.2. Typologies of Bilingual Programs

A brief glance at the development of bilingual education in the U.S. since 1963 gives an indication of the variety of plans possible in a bilingual program. Bilingual programs can differ greatly in objectives, pupil make-up, curricular structure, methodology, and many other respects. Recent literature on bilingual education gives recognition to the complexity of the subject. Within the last few years, several attempts have been made to simplify the subject of bilingual education by classifying bilingual programs into various types, according to differences in the areas just mentioned.

Certainly the most comprehensive or inclusive of the typologies of bilingual programs is William F. Mackey's Typology of Bilingual Education, which was referred to earlier in this paper. Because of the ambiguity of the term "bilingual school," Mackey felt that bilingual education could not be taken as an object for research. He therefore attempted to construct a typology of bilingual programs that would take all possible combinations of factors into account, one that would enable a person to "classify cases ranging from the unilingual education of bilingual children in unilingual communities to the bilingual education of unilingual children in bilingual communities" (1970, p. 65). In order to be of use to researchers, a typology of bilingual education would have to be based on certain objective criteria. Mackey finds such criteria in the pattern of

distribution of the languages in the home, in the curriculum of the school, in the community, and in the status of the languages themselves.

The most crucial aspect of the four dimensions in Mackey's typology, and the one dealt with at greatest length, concerns the pattern of languages in the school curriculum. Mackey notes that a bilingual school may use one, or two or more languages as mediums of instruction. Single-medium (S) schools may be bilingual to the extent that they serve children whose native tongue differs from that of the school, the area, or the nation. Schools that employ more than one language for instructional purposes are called dual-medium (D) schools. In a dual-medium school, languages may be given equal (E) or different (D) distributions in the curriculum. As seen on a time scale, the pattern of development may be one of maintenance (M) of two or more languages, or of transfer (T) from one to the other. The direction of change is categorized as acculturation (A) if it is toward assimilation into a dominant culture, or as irredentism (I) if it moves toward integration into a resurgent one. Finally, the rate of transfer from one medium to the other may be complete (C) or gradual (G). Various combinations of factors produce ten possible types of bilingual curricula, ranging from SAT (Single-Medium Acculturation Transfer), in which the school is completely acultural and takes no account of the language of the home, to DEM (Dual-Medium Equal Maintenance), where the school em-

ploys both languages equally in all areas of the curriculum (Ibid., pp. 66-72).

Although Mackey's system of classification offers the most comprehensive treatment of the typologies, many of his programs are not bilingual in the sense of involving "instruction in two languages." Most typologies of bilingual education are based on narrower considerations, such as the objectives of the program, or student or scheduling characteristics. An example of a typology based largely on the characteristics of the student population is that proposed in Joseph Michel's "Tentative Guidelines for a Bilingual Curriculum" (1967, pp. 13, 16). Michel's typology consists of three basic models, each of which reflects the differences in the language background of the students. The first plan is that of the United Consolidated Schools in Laredo, where few if any of the children are completely monolingual in Spanish or English. This program mixes English- and Spanish-speaking children in the same class under the direction of a bilingual teacher who conducts activities in both languages. In areas in which the children enter the school as monolinguals or very nearly, a second type of bilingual program becomes appropriate. This kind of program is similar to that of the bilingual school at Miami, where children are segregated in the first years of school and then brought together once they have attained sufficient capability in the second language. A third type of program is designed for schools in which all or nearly all of the students are

Spanish-speakers. Here one might begin by teaching mostly in Spanish, and then gradually increase the proportion of English as the language of instruction.

In "Organization of the Bilingual School" (1967), A. Bruce Gaarder offers a typology which, while recognizing the importance of student background, gives greater stress to scheduling factors as a basis for classifying bilingual programs. In Gaarder's words, "the most important factors entering into the structure of bilingual schools are the time allowed for each of the languages, the treatment and use of each language and whether the language which is added to the previously existing system is the mother tongue or not (p. 112). Gaarder sees two basic types of bilingual programs: 1) those which give equal time and treatment to the languages in the curriculum; and 2) those which give unequal time and treatment. The first type employs both languages as teaching mediums throughout the curriculum, and is exemplified by the Coral Way School at Miami. The second type of bilingual program, where one language is kept in a subordinate position, is much more common in schools throughout the world. Unequal time and treatment programs in the United States include those which use the home language of non-English speaking pupils to teach courses such as Spanish arts or literature for one class period a day. Either type of program may also be classified as one-way or two-way. Two-way schools, unlike one-way schools, include children from both language backgrounds (Ibid., pp. 111-117).

Another typology which bases its classification largely on the consideration of organizational factors in the curriculum is that presented by Horatio Ulibarri in Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educators (1970). Ulibarri distinguishes three general types of programs. The first type is one which initiates instruction in the vernacular and then gradually shifts over to English as the medium of instruction. In this type of program, which aims at the acculturation of minority children, the vernacular is phased out of the program as soon as the child is able to use English. A second type of program is that which maintains instruction in both languages throughout the duration of the curriculum. Such a program may use both languages as mediums of instruction in any or all subject areas. This kind of program typically emphasizes language development in both the native and second language, and both materials and teaching techniques are bilingual. The third type of program is the bilimgual-bicultural program. The bilingual-bicultural program stresses not only development in two languages, but the learning of two cultural systems; and cultural materials make up an integral part of the curriculum.

A further kind of typology is that which is based on an assessment of the objectives of a program, whether they are the stated objectives or those inherent in the approach, curricular structure, or methodology of a program. Joshua Fishman discusses such a typology in Bilingual Education in

Sociolinguistic Perspective, a paper delivered at the 1970 meeting of TESOL. Finding that bilingual programs often ignore the language goals of the community in developing their rationales, Fishman proposes a typology that "looks to the kinds of sociolinguistic development implied in the program objectives and suggests that various kinds of programs assume and lead to particular societal functional conditions on the part of the languages taught" (p. 3).

Fishman discusses four broad categories of bilingual education programs based on various kinds of community and school objectives. They are: 1) transitional bilingualism; 2) monoliterate bilingualism; 3) partial bilingualism; and 4) full bilingualism. Transitional bilingualism is typical of bilingual programs which use the non-English language in the early years of school only so long as the child requires it to "adjust to school" or to "master subject matter." Such programs do not aim at the development of speaking and writing skills in both languages, but rather state such goals as "increasing overall achievement of Spanish-speaking students by using both Spanish and English as media of instruction in the primary grades" (Ibid., p. 4). In the category of "monoliterate bilingualism" are programs which encourage the development of the child's oral ability in both languages, but do not attempt to inculcate literacy skills in the native tongue. Such programs are midway between those which aim at language shift and those which encourage language maintenance. The third type of program,

that of partial bilingualism, strives to develop literacy skills in both languages, but restricts the use of the mother tongue to a particular field or subject-matter. In this kind of program, subjects taught in the mother tongue usually include social studies, literature, and other culture-related material. Finally, in programs which emphasize full bilingualism as their main objective, both languages are used in all areas of the curriculum. This type of program aims at maintenance and development of the non-English language (Ibid., pp. 5-8).

From this brief examination of the typologies of bilingual education, it is possible to make two observations relevant to the purpose of this study. First, it is clear that since Mackey's system of classification is too comprehensive to permit a broad categorization of bilingual programs, his typology cannot be adopted in toto, though his terminology might be appropriate to describe certain aspects of the bilingual program. Secondly, the description of typologies has shown the interdependence of three crucial factors in the bilingual program: objectives, participants, and curriculum. For example, Michel's classification points up the importance of student background in the organization of the bilingual program, and Fishman's typology shows how the sociolinguistic objectives of a program are reflected in the curricular structure. Therefore, in setting up a typology of California bilingual programs, at least these three areas must be taken into consideration.

III. The Development of Bilingual Education in California

III.1. The Problem: Educating the Mexican-American

The origins of bilingual education in California, as in other parts of the Southwest, can be traced to a growing awareness in recent years of the educational needs and problems of the Mexican-American. While California in many ways represents a unique political entity in the area--it is easily the richest, most populous, and probably educationally the most progressive of the five Southwestern states--a recounting of its treatment of the Mexican-American makes a dismally familiar story. California was first colonized by Spanish-speaking people, though the number of early settlers was never large. During the first half of this century the size of the Spanish-speaking population was augmented by a continual flood of immigrants from Mexico. Many of these peoplewere from impoverished rural backgrounds and came to work as agricultural laborers on the rich farmlands of the central and southern valleys. Mexican immigrants soon became stereotyped as "poor, itinerant farm workers." Speaking a different language and economically on the bottom rung of society, they frequently encountered the hostility and prejudice of their better-established "gringo" neighbors. Discrimination against Mexican-Americans in California towns was widespread and sometimes quite obvious, taking such forms as the refusal of service at restaurants, restrictions in housing and employment, and the barring of "non-whites" from public facilities such as parks and swimming pools

California State Department of Education [hereafter CSDE], 1952, p. 3; Cooke, 1948, pp. 418-419).

Along with discrimination in other aspects of social life went segregation in the schools. A law enacted in 1885 and amended in 1893 provided for the segregation of Indians and Oriental in California public schools. To many administrators this included "Mexicans." It was the custom in California that Mexican-Americans were segregated at least until they had acquired a basic grasp of English; and separate schools for "Mexicans" and "Americans" were common in many localities (Ibid., p. 418). In the early years people did not view this segregation unfavorably. One can accept W. Henry Cooke's statement that:

> It did not look like discrimination twenty-five years ago to furnish these people with a small school and a teacher or two. The building did not have to be much better than their homes. The teacher might have been just anybody who would go "down there"; no results were to be expected. Mexican people were roving workers who were a charge upon any school district (Ibid.).

Segregation of Mexican-Americans was never absolute, for the larger schools districts soon abolished the practice, and parents of Mexican descent with sufficient influence could usually have an exception made for their children. Still, the practice continued to receive official sanction in many districts until 1948, when a federal court ruled in favor of five Mexican-American fathers who sought to prevent the assignment of their children to separate schools in Orange County. (For a discussion of the case, see Ibid.,

pp. 417-419; or Phillips, 1949.) Even beyond that date de facto segregation remained widespread as a result of restrictive housing practices.

Although individuals in the schools system had no doubt long been aware of the educational problems of Mexican-Americans in California, it was not until the early postwar period that state officials began to take full cognizance of the situation and to urge that special attention be given to meeting the needs of these children. In 1952 the State Department of Education issued a handbook entitled Teacher's Guide to the Education of Spanish-Speaking Children. The handbook takes due note of the economic and social deprivations of Mexican-Americans, and of the cultural isolation of this group resulting from discrimination. While the school cannot deal directly with such problems, it can and must act to "eliminate all inequalities that exist between their educational opportunities and those provided other children" (p. 9). Segregation of these children is discouraged, and the primary function of the school in their acculturation to the rest of society is affirmed: "The school plays a major role in the acculturation of Spanish-speaking children. As the school teaches a new language, it must also teach a new way of behaving" (p. 3). Essential to the child's acculturation is his mastery of English, and the handbook devotes considerable attention to the problems of teaching ESL. The teacher is advised to

"keep in mind that he is teaching a language that is foreign to the children" (p. 38), and that he must employ special techniques and provide the children with constant practice if he expects them to learn English properly.

As a result of natural increase and a wave of immigration from Mexico in the 1950's, the necessity of providing for the educational needs of Mexican-Americans became even more acute. It was estimated that the number of Spanish surnames in California increased by 88% in the decade from 1950 to 1960. The estimate on the 1960 census showed that from 11,000 to 15,000 school-age youngsters were the offspring of Mexican nationals who had immigrated to this country within the previous four years (CSDE, 1964b, p. 20). In 1963 the California State Legislature took a limited step toward recognizing the language handicap of these children by allocating $50,000 for a two-year, pilot English program for foreign-born minors in Imperial and San Diego Counties. In the eight school districts participating in the project, children received special English instruction for an extra half-hour or hour a day in small classes which usually met before or after regular school hours. The program was extended in 1965 to the whole state, and native as well as foreign-born children became eligible for the special instruction (CSDE, 1964a, pp. 32-33).

In the same year as the founding of the ESL projects in Imperial and San Diego Counties came further evidence

of the state's concern for its non-English speaking students. In 1963 the State Department of Education requested a grant from the federal government to develop guides for teaching English as a Second Language to elementary school pupils. As described in the proposal to the project, the guides would be aimed primarily at Spanish-speaking students, although consideration would also be given to the needs of children from other language backgrounds. The guides would be designed to provide a "sequential series of lessons based on audio-lingual principles of learning" (CSDE, 1964b, p. 1), and would contain directions to aid teachers in presenting the lessons. The chief advantage of the guides was seen as follows: "Use of the guides would enable teachers to give specific instruction in learning to understand and use English proficiently, and would thus increase the capacity of the children to profit from instruction in other subject matter areas" (Ibid.). The entire project would be developed over a two-year period at the University of California, Los Angeles, under the direction of four qualified linguists. What eventually issued from the project were the very successful and widely-used H200 series of ESL materials.

Simultaneous with these events, the Legislature took action to provide assistance to children of deprived cultural and socio-economic backgrounds by passing the McAteer, or Compensatory Education Act. A number of programs devel-

oped under the Act were designed specifically to improve the educational opportunities of Mexican-American children. These projects often differed in approach, scope, and objectives; but particular emphasis was placed on the development of the language arts and especially reading. One program in Los Angeles involved the assignment of two extra teachers to a school to achieve one or more of the following purposes: 1) to lower the pupil-teacher ratio; 2) to teach English to Spanish-speaking students; 3) to teach remedial reading (CSDE, 1964b, p. 46). In some of the programs for Mexican-Americans activities were conducted in Spanish as well as in English. For example, in a project at the Tenaya Junior High School in Merced pupils were tested on their ability to read, write, and speak Spanish; and then placed in homogeneous classes where they received instruction in Spanish language and culture for one period a day (CSDE, 1965, p. 19).

The rising concern for the education of the Mexican-American is shown by the fact that in 1964 the State Department of Education held two weekend conferences to discuss the subject: one at Garden Grove (Orange County) on February 14-15; and one at Oxnard (Ventura County) on October 16-17. At the conferences members attended speeches, panel discussions, and study sections which dealt with different aspects of Mexican-American education. Topics discussed include: the progress and special problems of Mexican-Americans; the need for teachers to understand their cul-

tural differences; the importance of gaining the confidence of Mexican-American parents; the characteristics of an effective ESL program; the in-service training of teachers for Mexican-Americans, etc. Much of the discussion centered on the necessity for improving the English capabilities of the students so that they could cope more effectively with the requirements of the regular curriculum. There was little talk, as yet, about the need for "bilingual education." But Julian Samora, one of the speakers at the Orange County Conference, may have been anticipating future developments in that direction when he posed the question:

> Can the curriculum be changed in such a way that it takes advantage of the cultural resources of this group-- their language, their history, their cultural heritage-- thus producing a bilingual child cognizant of his rich heritage, who is not ashamed of who he is? (CSDE, 1964b, p. 46).

III.2. The Impact of Federal Legislation

In the 1960's California's educational plans came more and more under the influence of federal policies to enhance the rights of disadvantaged minority children. In one area, the Supreme Court desegregation decisions of the previous decade (along with the rising militancy of the civil rights movement) spurred the state to take active steps to promote integration in the public schools. In 1965 the California School Board Association stated that administrators should be encouraged to "analyze the extent of racial imbalance in their district and take steps to ameliorate any imbalances which are found to exist" (quoted in Carter, 1970, p. 73). While complying with pressures for integration, California also felt the increasing impact of compensatory federal legislation in the area of education. The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1956, for example, authorized funds to provide supplementary counseling and guidance services for disadvantaged students, and to assist the training of teachers for these students. With the approval of Congress the Office of Economic Opportunity launched Project Head ftart, an undertaking which aimed at providing preschool programs for large numbers of disadvantaged minority children. However, the single most important piece of compensatory legislation enacted in this period was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. Titles I, III, and V of the ESEA provided funding for a wide range of programs undertaken on behalf of Mexican-American children in

California.

Title I of the ESEA authorizes grants to local educational agencies serving areas with a high percentage of children from low-income families to improve and expand their educational programs. California received an allocation of $77,975,73 in Title I funds for the 1965-66 school year. Remedial reading and English as a Second Language were important activities of Title I programs involving Mexican-Americans.in California. ESL classes were often experimental and used a variety of approaches, including English laboratories and bilingual teachers. In some districts Mexican-American children who could not speak English were given intensive instruction in both Spanish and English. The assumption was that students would improve in English more rapidly if their facility in Spanish and pride in their native culture were enhanced (CSDE, 1967a, pp. 1-16). Through 1966 amendments to Title I, the education of children of migrant agricultural workers became a special focus of attention. Since most of the migrant children were Mexican-Americans with limited facility in English, language instruction was strongly emphasized. A special feature of the migrant programs was the use of Spanish-speaking teacher aides, who provided individualized instruction for the children and helped to maintain direct contact with the parents (CDSE, 1968b, p. 18).

Another important source of funding for new programs for Mexican-Americans came under Title III of the ESEA.

Title III provides grants to local educational agencies to establish "innovative" and "exemplary" programs for disadvantaged students. It was expected that projects would provide services not previously available and develop methods, materials, and curricula that would serve as models for other programs. California received $5,996,364 in Title III funds for Fiscal Year 1966. Among the programs aimed at Mexican-Americans were a demonstration-research center in Stockton to test out methods in teaching beginning reading to bilingual students, and a project in San Diego County to demonstrate exemplary methods and materials in teaching ESL (U.S. Office of Education, 1968, pp. 4-5). Also with the aid of Title III funds, a model bilingual program for Mexican-American students in grades 7, 8, and 9 was established in Calexico. The Calexico project represents a significant departure from most programs hitherto developed for Mexican-Americans. Until that time few programs had emphasized the teaching of Spanish, although earlier programs had used Spanish on a limited basis for purposes such as to raise the self-esteem of the students and to communicate with parents. The Calexico project, on the other hand, was one of the first in California to propose the teaching of major academic subjects in both English and Spanish.

The Calexico program arose out of a very strongly felt need to provide special education for the local Mexican-American population. Calexico, California, with approximately 9,400 inhabitants, is located in the lush Imperial

Valley adjacent to the Mexican border. The Calexico area is largely dependent on agriculture for its economy. With the termination of the bracero program, the area recently experienced a large influx of Mexican immigrants who came seeking employment as farm workers. Large numbers of Spanish-speaking children entered the school system as a result of this migration, and by 1966 Mexican-Americans comprised nearly 85% of the school population. In January of the same year the Calexico Union High School applied to the federal government for a planning grant to identify the general educational needs of persons in the area. It was found on the basis of teacher reports that a significant number of pupils were not making adequate progress due to their lack of facility in English. The education of older students was felt to be a special area of concern:

> These pupils [in junior high and high schools], due to their chronological age, so close to the potential drop-out age, are in special need of instruction in their native language of Spanish in academic areas. They will need to be kept in the mainstream of learning and the actual acquisition of knowledge while they are in the process of acquiring mastery in the English language (Calexico Union High School, 1966, p. 5).

In response to these needs, a bilingual education program in grades 7, 8, and 9 was planned to begin operation in the 1966-67 academic year. Although the project would serve mainly Mexican-Americans, Anglo students were also included in the program since the ultimate goal was to "have all children of the Calexico School District become bilingual" (Ibid., p. 4). English-speaking pupils in the program

would be given instruction in Spanish as a foreign language, while Spanish-speaking pupils would be taught ESL. In order to promote self-concept and to develop literacy in the native language, Spanish speakers would also receive specialized instruction in Spanish grammar, literature, and composition. Languages would be taught by native speakers proficient in the use of audio-lingual methods. It was proposed that subject areas such as social studies and mathematics be taught bilingually in classes where learners were grouped according to proficiency in English and Spanish. For the Spanish aspect of the program, the district would attempt to procure Spanish language materials whose content paralleled that found in state-adopted textbooks. Once a student acquired sufficient proficiency in English, he would be transferred to the regular English-language classes (Ibid., p. 5ff.; Calexico Unified School District, 1967, p. 4ff.).

The enactment of Title V of the ESEA also had important consequences for the education of Mexican-Americans in California. Title V authorizes direct grants to state educational agencies to help improve their "leadership resources," that is, their capacity to initiate educational change on a statewide scale. With funding from Title V, the State Department of Education established the Mexican-American Education Research Project in 1966. The primary objective of the Project was to coordinate the efforts of interested agencies and individuals in an attempt to dis-

cover new ways of improving the education of Mexican-American children in California. As one of its primary activities, the Project undertook to evaluate the needs and present status of Mexican-American children in California public schools. From November 1966 to April 1967 it conducted a statewide survey by questionnaire. Among the findings, it was discovered that only a few of the districts where significant numbers of these children were enrolled offered any district-wide programs for Spanish-speaking children (Plakos, 1967, p. 11). The Project also developed two smaller research studies to assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mexican-American students in the communities of Wasco and San Ysidro. The studies confirmed earlier reports that Mexican-Americans fell progressively behind other students in perceptual motor development and academic achievement. Mexican-American students also suffered from a lowered self-concept, apparently the result of the conflicting demands of Anglo and Mexican cultures (CSDE, 1968c, pp. 23-29; Palomares, 1967, p. 28ff.).

In its search for new methods of teaching Mexican-American children, the Project pioneered the development of a bilingual project in Marysville, an agricultural community in Northern California. In the fall of 1966, a group of nineteen Spanish-speaking children ranging in age from 6 to 10 years were selected for an experimental program at the Mary Covillaud School. The purpose of the project was to devise a curriculum that would serve the

special needs of these children and aid their transition to the normal school program. All subjects were taught by an experienced bilingual teacher with the assistance of a bilingual teacher aide who was a native of Mexico. Content areas in arithmetic, history, geography and science were adapted in Spanish, and the children learned to read syllables first, and then words in their native language. English was taught on an oral basis using the H200 materials developed at UCLA, with incidental learnings accruing from daily contact with English-speaking pupils on the playground, in physical education, music, art, and other school affairs. Music as a bilingual activity was especially stressed: "Several times a week, other primary classes would drop in and join the singing, sometimes in English and sometimes in Spanish as both groups exchanged songs and finger plays" (Thonis, 1967, p. 16). By the end of the academic term seven pupils who had made sufficient progress in English and in content matter via Spanish were recommended to join the regular classes for the next school year. Favorable aspects of the program were seen in the "increased confidence of the pupils, their improved participation in class, their expanded use of language, both Spanish and English, and the approval of parents" (Ibid., p. 17).

As indicated, early efforts to improve the education of Mexican-Americans in California concentrated largely on the development of ESL, remedial reading, and other compen-

satory programs which used English as the medium of instruction. Although a few of these programs may have called themselves "bilingual," bilingual instructional programs such as those at Calexico and Marysville were in a distinct minority. In a speech before the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers in 1967, Julia Gonsalves remarked:

> We find in California, as we find elsewhere in the nation, programs which are erroneously labeled "bilingual." If we accept the dictionary definition of "bilingual" as "containing, expressed in, or using, two languages," we find a relatively few number of districts offering complete bilingual programs (p. 62).

Gonsalves mentions the existence of only two other bilingual programs besides the Calexico and Marysville projects. These programs, located in Cakland and San Jose, also involved the teaching of content areas such as reading, mathematics, or social studies in Spanish to Mexican-Americans who had been identified as deficient in English. By this time, however, a trend favoring bilingual education had become evident in state policy.

III.3. The Trend Toward Bilingual Education

As a result of their assessments of the problems of Mexican-Americans in California's public schools, the Mexican American Education Research Project had soon come to realize the ineffectiveness of traditional approaches in teaching Spanish-speaking children. The success of the bilingual project in Marysville indicated that a possible solution might lie in the use of Spanish to teach content areas in the early years of school. The State Educational Code, however, remained an obstacle to the development of further bilingual programs, since it specified that "all schools" must be taught in the English language. In 1967 the Project recommended to the State Legislative Committee that the Code be amended to permit instruction in two languages (Plakos, 1967, pp. 13-14). In an historic move, the Legislature followed suit by passing SB53, later known as the "Bilingual Bill." For the first time, the bill gives authorization to the governing board of any school to determine "when and under what circumstances instruction may be given bilingually" (Gonsalves, 1967, p. 62).

The publication of the Prospectus for Equitable Educational Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Children marks another important event in the trend toward bilingual education in California. This document, issued by the Mexican American Education Research Project in 1967, aims to show how schools can develop programs that deal more effectively with the educational problems of Spanish-speaking pupils.

The rationale for a bilingual program for Mexican-Americans is laid out as follows: "The high dropout rate of Mexican-Americans and their low achievement scores in statewide testing suggest these pupils cannot succeed if they are required to use English exclusively in their early schooling" (CSDE, 1967b, p. 11). Accordingly, a plan is proposed whereby both Spanish and English are used in the first three years of school.

The Prospectus discusses two main aspects of the bilingual program: 1) the persons involved in the program; and 2) the organization of the program itself. Persons involved in the program include pupils, teachers, teacher aides, and parents. The pupils for who the Prospectus was developed are identified as native speakers of Spanish from a low socio-economic, urban environment. It is recognized that many of these students "have serious deficits in experience, concept development, and language which prevent their coping with the traditional school program" (Ibid., p. 3). The Prospectus then describes the abilities and professional qualifications of teachers who would participate in a bilingual program. Among the special qualifications expected of teachers of Spanish-speaking children are: 1) fluency in English and Spanish; 2) knowledge of the cultural background of these students; 3) experience in community action projects; and 4) special training in workshops dealing with Mexican-American children. Teacher aides are identified as persons from the community who work under the authority of

the teacher; and the use of Spanish-speaking aides is encouraged in order to give pupils "the extra personal attention they need, to involve their parents in the program, and to recruit responsible support from the community" (Ibid., p. 5). To insure more effective implementation of the bilingual program, the Prospectus recommends that regular in-service training be provided for teachers and teacher aides. The Prospectus also touches on the need to involve parents, and suggests ways to bring them into the bilingual program (Ibid., p. 6).

The Prospectus then lays out a plan for a type of program that might best serve the needs of the children identified. Since these children come to school with a working knowledge of Spanish but often little or no command of English, Spanish is especially emphasized at the beginning of the program to teach basic concepts and to enhance the self-image of the children. The use of Spanish then gives way to English in order to prepare the children for an all-English curriculum by the beginning of the fourth year. The following time distribution is suggested:

Level	Language	% of Time
Kindergarten	Spanish	80
	English	20
First Grade	Spanish	60
	English	40
Second Grade	Spanish	30
	English	70

(Ibid., p. 11)

According to the Prospectus, language instruction should be audio-lingual in sequence, with listening and speaking leading eventaully to reading and writing. Therefore, children should begin to read and write in their native language, Spanish. After they have learned to understand and speak sufficient English they can be advanced to reading and writing in English, perhaps by the end of the second year. The Prospectus recommends a number of activities which could aid in the linguistic development of these children in either Spanish or English, and in conclusion lists a set of materials helpful in implementing the suggested activities (Ibid., pp. 12-16, 19-30).

On April 13, 1967, a group of educators met at Los Angeles for the first annual Nuevas Vistas Conference, a meeting on Mexican-American education sponsored by the State Department of Education. In a sense the conference represented a culminating point in the discussion of the problem. Many of the needs of Mexican-Americans had already been identified. In his address to the delegates, Max Rafferty, Chief Superintendent of Public Instruction, mentions a few of these:

> You know that you need, first of all, bilingual teachers who know the language and culture of the Spanish-speaking child and who can become the bridge for them into a bicultural world. You know that you need many kinds of materials to break the learning gap in this period. You know that it is necessary to reach these parents even before you get the students. . . (CSDE, 1968d, p. 5).

The question remained: How best to deal with these and the other special needs of Spanish-speaking children? It seemed

self-evident by now that a change in the curriculum was called for: "Attention was focussed on the curriculum itself as a place where examination is needed for improving the education for Mexican-Americans" (Ibid., p. 24).

In individual addresses and in workshops, conference members discussed the type of curriculum best suited for Spanish-speaking pupils. Such a curriculum must, first of all, consider the special language needs of these children. The Workshop on Curriculum Development advised that: "We should guard against throwing the child into a total English language experience. A gradual program starting with auditory experiences and branching out from there would be more effective" (Ibid.). In order not to retard the child's acquisition of content material, the Workshop report recommended that such material be taught in Spanish if bilingual personnel are available. In the opinion of other conference participants, a program for Mexican-Americans must also take the child's native culture into account because, according to Herschel T. Manuel,

> knowing the child's cultural background is an essential first step toward improving his educational opportunities. Armed with this knowledge he [the teacher] can acquaint the children with the world in which they live and its history as well as its present and future (Ibid., p. 4).

An ideal program for Spanish-speaking children, therefore, would be at once bilingual and bicultural. The summary view of the conference is represented by the "Bilingual Resolution," a statement of the conference in support of legisla-

tion pending before Congress to promote the establishment of bilingual education programs (Ibid., p. 34).

Although a few bilingual programs had been developed under the provisions of the ESEA, a rising national trend in favor of bilingual education caused a demand for more specific legislation. The extent of this demand is shown by the fact that in 1967 some 30 bills in the area of bilingual education were introduced in Congress. In June, 1967, Congressional subcommittees conducted hearings on three bilingual bills: S.428, H.R.9840 and H.R.10224. At the hearings California lawmakers, educators, and leaders of various Mexican-American groups testified in favor of the various bills. Most of those testifying supported the idea of separate bilingual legislation. It was realized that:

> State and local authorities have not been able to provide bilingual programs for non-English speaking children because of the avalanche of other priorities they feel they must provide for. State and local authorities simply have not put an emphasis on bilingual programs and on solving the tragic problems of the non-English speaking child (from the statement of Augustus F. Hawkins, California Representative in Congress, in: U.S. House of Representatives, 1967, p. 96).

Reasons for the failure to develop bilingual programs were also seen in the lack of trained bilingual teachers and of bilingual materials. The hope was expressed that new legislation in support of bilingual education programs would provide funds to help overcome these problems. (See the statements of Arnold Rodriguez, Director of Community Relations, Los Angeles City Schools, in: U.S. Senate, 1967, p. 462; and of Dr. Irving Melbo, Dean of the University of Southern

California, Los Angeles, in: U.S. House of Representatives, 1967, p. 256.)

Much of the debate over the bills centered on whether the benefits of bilingual education should be reserved primarily for Spanish speakers as the nation's largest linguistic minority, or be shared by other non-English speaking groups as well. Certainly the concern for alleviating the plight of Mexican-Americans was uppermost in the minds of California witnesses. Speaking on behalf of S.428, a bill designed to develop programs exclusively for Spanish speakers, Ricardo A. Callejo of the Spanish-Speaking Surnamed Political Association argued that "Spanish-English bilingual education be given priority based on the constitutional precedents and cumulative problems of the Spanish-speaking" (U.S. Senate, 1967, p. 453). Other witnesses cited figures indicating the low educational attainment and high drop-out rate of Mexican-Americans in California, and recommended bilingual education as a means to reversing this trend. California Senator George Murphy, a co-author of S.428, stated that "this measure. . . will mark a significant step in reversing the alarming drop-out rate among Mexican-American school children" (Ibid., p. 422). In a similar vein, Ernest E. Debs, a Supervisor for Los Angeles County, expressed his conviction that the bill would "extend the proven benefits of Operation Headstart by teaching both in English and in Spanish. Thus, the language barrier will be eliminated, and Mexican-American youngsters will have an

equal opportunity in school" (Ibid., p. 432).

Although most California witnesses seemed to agree on the advantages of bilingual education for Mexican-Americans, there was a considerable difference of opinion on the ultimate purpose of the programs proposed in the legislation. To some, bilingual programs were simply a means to improving the academic achievement of non-English speaking students. In the words of George E. Brown, Representative in Congress from California, such programs were "designed to facilitate learning by and for these students who find that they are better equipped to learn in another language" (U.S. Senate, 1967, p. 426). To others, the establishment of bilingual programs meant rather the opportunity to cultivate the non-English language resources of the nation. In his statement before the House hearings on bilingual education, California Senator Thomas A. Kuchel remarked: "So today we are here to recognize that the ability of millions of Americans to speak Spanish and other foreign languages is a national asset. Our educational policy must fully reflect this view" (U.S. House of Representatives, 1967, p. 423). On the other hand, a number of witnesses expressed the viewpoint that the true purpose of bilingual programs was to bring the non-English speaking children into the mainstream of American life. For these persons, the native language would not be taught as an end in itself, but as a bridge to the improved learning of English: "To fully realize the letter and spirit of this legislation, we must insist on using the secon-

dary language as a means to implement and facilitate the learning of English as our principal national tongue" (from the statement of Chet Holifield, Representative in Congress from California, in: Ibid., p. 313). These differing views on the purpose of bilingual education programs, while not necessarily conflicting, were to be reflected in the different types of programs later developed in California under the Bilingual Education Act.

With the help of its California supporters, a measure to support bilingual education programs was finally adopted as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title VII, otherwise known as the Bilingual Education Act, provided funding for projects in bilingual and bicultural education in a wide variety of settings. According to the administrative guidelines of the Act, programs eligible for funding might emphasize such activities as courses in the native history and culture of the student; efforts to improve school-community relations; early childhood and adult education programs; bilingual education for part-time pupils, drop-outs or potential drop-outs; or bilingual courses conducted by trade, vocational, or technical schools. Besides authorizing money for the actual operation of programs, Title VII also provided support for supplementary services such as pre- and in-service training for teachers and the development and dissemination of materials (CSDE, 1968a, pp. 1-2). Funding was delayed until 1969, when a total of 10 million dollars became available. With funds from this

appropriation, twenty-six bilingual programs began operation in California in the 1969-70 academic year.

III.4. Summary

Bilingual education in California arose out of a series of largely uncoordinated efforts to improve the education of the Mexican-American which first resulted in the development of ESL, remedial reading, and other compensatory education programs. In these early programs Spanish was occasionally used to achieve such purposes as to aid communication with the parents and to enhance the self-esteem of the children, but English reamined the chief medium of instruction. Eventually, however, due in large part to the pioneering efforts of the Mexican American Education Research Project, a trend developed to establish programs which used both English and the native language to teach subjects in major curricular areas.

Nevertheless, there remained a great deal of uncertainty about the concept and purpose of "bilingual education." Programs in California which did not use two languages in teaching subject-matter were apparently still being called "bilingual." Because of contrasting views concerning the needs of Mexican-Americans in different localities, and as a result of differences in the age levels and language background of students selected for bilingual programs, early projects in bilingual education were often quite dissimilar. Thus, in comparing the Marysville and Calexico projects--the first two really bilingual programs in the state--one finds little in common beyond a general desire to help the Mexican-American and the use of Spanish

and English to teach subject-matter in the curriculum. The continued confusion over the import of bilingual education is also reflected in the fact that although California lawmakers seemed to approve the idea of bilingual education for Mexican-Americans, they appeared to differ substantially over the ultimate purpose of bilingual programs.

IV. Title VII Programs in California

IV.1. Objectives

The first task in the investigation of Title VII programs in California was to make a comparative study of objectives. This proved to be no easy undertaking. First of all, there was the problem of which objectives to consider. Chester A. Christian, writing in the Reports of the Third Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers (1966, pp. 71-72), enumerates a total of fifteen possible objectives for a bilingual program, and his list is far from exhaustive. Similarly, project proposals for Title VII programs provide, with no mention of priority, long lists of objectives of various types. As described in these proposals, objectives of bilingual programs may embrace goals for the community as well as for the children in the program; they may be long-term or short-term; they may or may not be stated in behavioral terms, etc. On the other hand, it seems clear that not all these objectives are useful in distinguishing various types of programs, nor are they rated as equally important by the programs themselves. In this paper only the long-range goals that are applicable to the students themselves with be dealt with, since these seem the most likely to reveal the "thrust" of a particular program.

To determine which objectives are most preferred by Title VII programs in California, a ranking scheme was employed in the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to

rank a list of objectives compiled from those most frequently mentioned in project proposals and other relevant literature. Because of the difference in focus, objectives for non-English speakers (X-speakers) were separated from objectives for English-speakers (E-speakers). The five objectives selected for the former centered on the more practical immediate needs of minority students growing up in the American environment, such as development in English, academic achievement through use of the mother tongue, improvement of self-image, and adjustment to the dominant society. The three objectives for E-speakers, on the other hand, stressed the more academic values of learning a second language and culture. In addition to the objectives listed, blank spaces were provided to allow respondents to supply their own objectives, if desired.

Of the 23 programs which made data available for this study, 16 supplied rankings that could be subjected to statistical analysis. (For the statistical formulas used in this section, see Siegel, 1956.) The rankings of objectives by the 16 programs for both X- and E-speaking students are presented in Table 1. The first thing of note concerns the general lack of agreement over the priority of objectives. With the exceptions of Objectives II and V for X-speakers, objectives are ranked in all positions at least once. The extent of agreement as measured by Kendall's coefficient of concordance was determined for X-speakers at .25, and for E-speakers as .21. This corresponds to an average between-

TABLE 1: OBJECTIVES

A. Objectives for X-speakers
- I= To enable the students to gain a functional mastery of English.
- II= To improve the academic achievement of the students by using the mother tongue to further concept development.
- III= To promote the students' feeling of dignity and self-worth by emphasizing the value of the native culture.
- IV= To enable the students to develop a bilingual, bicultural world view.
- V= To help the students achieve maximum success in adapting to the dominant society.

B. Objectives for E-speakers
- I= To enable the students to gain a mastery of the second language without detriment to their learning in English.
- II= To cultivate in the students an understanding and appreciation of the second culture.
- III= To develop in the students an impartial attitude toward their own and the second culture and language.

PROGRAM	RANKING OF OBJECTIVES							
	X-speakers					E-speakers		
	I	II	III	IV	V	I	II	III
1. Chula Vista	3	2	1	4	5	3	2	1
2. Compton	2	1	3	4	5	-	-	-
3. El Monte	5	2	1	3	4	3	2	1
4. Fresno County	1	2	3	4	5	3	2	1
5. Hawaiian Gardens	2	1	3	4	5	3	1	2
6. Healdsburg	3	2	4	1	5	1	2	3
7. La Puente	4	1	2	5	3	3	1	2
8. Los Nietos	5	4	2	1	3	3	2	1
9. Redwood City	3	4	2	1	5	2	3	1
10. Sacramento	5	2	1	3	4	2	1	3
11. St. Helena	3	1	5	2	4	-	-	-
12. San Francisco	1	4	5	2	3	-	-	-
13. Sanger	1	3	4	5	2	3	1	2
14. Santa Ana	3	1	2	5	4	2	1	3
15. Santa Barbara	5	1	2	3	4	3	2	1
16. Stockton	4	1	2	3	5	3	2	1
Totals	50	32	42	49	67	34	22	22

schools agreement as measured by Spearman's rank order correlation of .20 and .14, neither of which is significantly different from 0 at the .05 level of significance.

In spite of the overall lack of agreement in ranking, some objectives in each group are clearly favored over others. Of the five objectives listed for X-speaking students, Objective II (academic achievement through use of the mother tongue) ranks first seven times, or more than twice as often as any other objective in the group, for a total score of 32.* There follow in close order Objectives III (improved self-concept through emphasis on native culture); IV (development of bilingual, bicultural world view); and I (mastery of English); with scores of 42, 49, and 50 respectively. In contrast, Objective V (adjustment to the dominant society) ranks well below the others, receiving fifth place in eight out of sixteen cases, for a total score of 67. In fact, a two-tailed sign test shows that schools prefer Objective II over Objective V at about the .02 level of significance. The ranking of objectives for X-speakers suggests that most programs place greater priority on the development of the minority child within his own language and culture than on his assimilation to the language and culture of the American society. Still, the learning of English remains a significant goal for some programs, since three respondents rate it as their most important, and two

*Since scores are based on the sums of rankings, a low score indicates high priority.

others as their second most important objective.

An analysis of objectives for E-speaking children also yields evidence of certain goal preferences. Among the three objectives listed here, Objectives II (appreciation of the second culture) and III (impartial attitude toward one's own and the second language and culture) are ranked equally over Objective I (mastery of the second language), with scores of 22 to 34. A two-tailed sign test shows preference of these two objectives over Objective I at about a .02 level of significance. From this result it appears that the sponsors of bilingual programs are most interested in affecting the attitudes of E-speaking children toward the minority language group, and are only secondarily concerned about their development in the second language.

Turning to evidence from questionnaires not dealt with in the statistical analysis, one finds little to alter the preceding description. The general lack of agreement over objectives is underscored by the fact that respondents for a number of programs declined to rank the standard objectives as requested. From several programs (e.g. Barstow, Fresno City, Santa Clara) came the comment that the objectives as listed were "all equally important," thereby indicating that in these cases the standard objectives are perhaps only marginally related to the goals as perceived by the programs themselves. Others changed the wording of some objectives so as to alter their meaning substantially. For example, the respondent for the Marysville program al-

tered Objective V to read "To help the students achieve maximum success in content areas--math, science, etc.", a change which underscores that program's intent to improve the academic achievement of Spanish-speaking pupils by using the mother tongue. Write-in objectives tended to be idiosyncratic, e.g. Compton's "Enrich our cultural scene and enable the minority ethnic group to maintain themselves at a culturally creative level," or El Monte's "To effectualize the affective domain."(!)

During the visits to program sites, persons were asked what they felt were the most important objectives of their program for : 1) non-English speaking students; and 2) English-speaking students. Answers to this question were highly varied, but in general corroberate the results of the questionnaire. Concerning the objectives for X-speaking students, there seem to be two main bodies of opinion. For the first group, the development of the student in his native language apparently receives primary consideration. Thus, according to Adan Rodriguez, coordinator of the bilingual project at Marysville, "The ideal is to have him [the Spanish-speaking child] master the language in Spanish at the end of the eighth or ninth grade" (personal interview). Although few persons at bilingual programs expressed quite as much enthusiasm for the development of native language abilities, many others (e.g. interviewees at Compton, Santa Barbara, Santa Ana, Santa Clara) made clear that their most important goal is to improve the academic achievement of

X-speaking children by use of the native tongue. On the other hand, a second group feels that the child's development in English is their primary objective. In the words of Caesar Orsini, the most important objective for the students of the Chinese bilingual program in San Francisco is to "teach them English as fast as possible so they can fit into the educational system. . . ." Beyond these two groups, a few programs prefer such goals as "to develop communications skills in both languages" (Pomona); to "lift the self-image of the Mexican-American child" (Sacramento); or simply, "to help Mexican-Americans" (Brentwood).

Goals for the English-speaking students are somewhat less controversial. Although several interviewees mentioned the need for the English-speaking child to acquire the second language, goals of improvement in basic academic skills and cross-cultural understanding were more frequently emphasized. According to Harriette Jowett, director of the Fresno County bilingual project, the main objective for English-speaking students in their program is less to teach them Spanish than to make them functional in English "because they need language development in their native tongue" (personal interview). Goals which are occasionally emphasized for E-speakers as well as for X-speakers include: "self-image" (Los Nietos); "to instill pride in first and second cultures and langauges" (Redwood City); and "to produce bilingual, bicultural individuals" (Sacramento).

IV.2. Participants

In examining various types of bilingual programs, it is clearly important to take into consideration the background of the students themselves. As has been noted, at least one typology of bilingual education (Michel's) is based primarily on student characteristics. According to Andersson and Boyer, there are two factors in the student's background which should be considered carefully in developin a bilingual program. One of these is the child's linguistic past: that is, his preparedness to receive the education he needs in English or X, or both. The obvious significance of this factor is underlined by Atilano Valencia, who states: "The type of bilingual program, the instructional strategies in the instructional scheme, and the types of materials to use must be relevant to the level of Spanish and English comprehension and usage" (1969, p. 3). The second factor is the child's context--"the social and psychological impact that he can be expected to experience as a result of the particular school program in which he is placed" (Andersson and Boyer, 1970, p. 94). In consideration of this factor, it is necessary to take into account the child's community and his family background, since these are probably the two most important determinants of social context.

An important aspect of the investigation of Title VII programs was to determine the language background of the students. Information concerning the native language back-

ground of students participating in various programs was obtained in the questionnaire, the results of which appear in Table 2. Looking first at the total figures, one finds that the number of native English speakers is given as 1,651, or approximately 38% of the total number of students. Spanish is by far the most common non-English language represented: students of Spanish-speaking background number 2,576 (59%), as compared with only 137 "other" (3%). The students of "other" language background are composed largely of Portuguese-speaking students in the Hawaiian Gardens program, and the Chinese-speaking students in the bilingual program in San Francisco.

In examining the mix of students in various bilingual programs, one finds there are no projects composed wholly of E-speaking students, since this pattern was not fundable under the BEA. On the other hand, bilingual programs appear to follow one of three patterns with regard to their student populations. In a small number of programs X-speaking children are in the minority. Thus in Fresno City, Sacramento, and La Puente, X-speakers constitute from 16.7 to 40% of the student population. Most programs are mixed (i.e. contain children of both language backgrounds) with the percentage of X-speaking students averaging somewhat over half of the total enrollment. This type is represented by 14 of the 23 programs in the survey. However, there are also six programs (Compton, Marysville, San Francisco, St. Helena, and Pomona) where X-speaking students

TABLE 2: PARTICIPANTS

PROGRAM	Total # pupils	Language Background			% X-sp.
		Span.	E	other	
1. Barstow	143	99	41	3	62.2
2. Brentwood	28	14	14		50.0
3. Calexico	180	120*	60*		66.7
4. Chula Vista	580	513	67		88.4
5. Compton	44	44			100.0
6. El Monte	29	15	14		51.7
7. Fresno City	120	20*	100		16.7
8. Fresno County	113	87	26		76.9
9. Hawaiian Gardens	170	9	54	107	68.2
10. Healdsburg	22	16	6		72.2
11. La Puente	1,240	596*	644*		40.0
12. Los Nietos	30	21	9		70.0
13. Marysville	178	178			100.0
14. Pomona	100	100			100.0
15. Redwood City	30	20	10		66.7
16. Sacramento	262	87	175		33.3
17. St. Helena	35	32	1	2	97.1
18. San Francisco	25			25	100.0
19. Sanger	56	40	16		71.4
20. Santa Ana	90	68*	22*		75.0
21. Santa Barbara	149	108	41		72.5
22. Santa Clara	40	40			100.0
23. Stockton	700	350*	350*	—	50.0
Totals	4364	2576	1651	137	62.2 (av.)

*approximate; based on percentage calculations

make up all or nearly all of the project enrollment.

Certain important questions relating to the language background of the students were not dealt with in the questionnaire. One of these concerns the extent of bilingualism in the student population. Clearly, a large proportion of X-speaking students could be expected to be bilingual, especially since many had already had a number of years of schooling in English. The issue of the extent of monolingualism vs. bilingualism was brought up during the interviews. Many of the persons interviewed mentioned that there was a wide range of bilingualism among their students: in the bilingual class in Healdsburg, for example, six children were considered monolingual English-speakers, one boy as monolingual in Spanish, and the rest (16) bilingual to varying degrees in Spanish and English. In most programs, children of E-speaking background are more likely to be monolingual than X-speakers, since for the most part E-speakers have had less exposure to the second language. Monolingual X-speakers tend to be concentrated in primary-level programs designed exclusively for X-speaking children (e.g. Compton, Marysville, San Francisco).

Turning next to the background of the students in their community, one finds a number of interesting trends. First, it appears that although Title VII programs are located in a wide variety of geographical settings, both urban and rural, the great majority are situated in urban or semi-urban areas which contain a large non-English

speaking population. On the other hand, these minority populations tend to vary greatly in character. In some areas they are composed largely of recent immigrants to this country who have had little chance to mix with the local population. The students in the Chinese bilingual project in San Francisco, for example, are drawn largely from a body of recent immigrants from Hong Kong who have taken up residence in the Chinatown district of that city. Other programs were established in areas where members of the minority ethnic group have long made up part of the community, and are often bilingual, if not monolingual in English. The Mexican-American populations of La Puente and Pomona tend to be of this type.

Naturally, the family backgrounds of students in bilingual programs tend to reflect this geographical and ethnic diversity. In Marysville, for example, a fair number of the parents of Spanish-speaking pupils are recent arrivals (10 out of 65), and somewhat over half of the parents were born in Mexico (Adan Rodriguez, personal interview). However, since Title VII specified that a proportion of the students must meet certain low-income criteria, there is one element in family background that characterizes children in all programs: low socio-economic status. This is particularly true for children of the minority language group. Thus in Chula Vista, the percentage of children in the target area whose mother tongue is other than English and who come from low-income families is estimated at 65%

(Sweetwater Union School District, 1969, p. 5), while in Compton all students in the bilingual program come either from families who are receiving AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) allowances, or whose income is under $3600 (Frank M. Goodman, personal interview).

IV.3. Curriculum

The curriculum forms the most complex, and perhaps the most important component of the bilingual program to be examined here. One variable of the curriculum relates to the grade levels taught: bilingual programs may occur at all levels and the range of subjects will, of course, vary greatly according to this difference. Then there is the question of which languages are used to teach which subjects. As stated in the UNESCO Report on International Seminar on Bilingual Education (1965), "The relative roles of the mother tongue and the second language as vehicles for the teaching of other subjects is of basic significance in bilingual education, and has considerable implications for the curriculum" (pp. 189-90). Moreover, in dealing with different aspects of the curriculum, one must consider questions of time, although Andersson and Boyer (1970) prefer to treat this as a separate component. Here it becomes necessary to treat such subjects as the total amount of time devoted to the languages over the entire curriculum, and the extent and rate of language shift.

The first aspect of the curriculum to be considered is the grade levels taught. A breakdown of the grade levels in various bilingual programs is shown in Table 3. As one can see, primary school programs are by far the most prevalent type of program, there being only six projects (Calexico, Hawaiian Gardens, Marysville, Pomona, St. Helena, Chula Vista) which incorporate the junior high or high

TABLE 3: CURRICULUM

Key: Ch Lang=Chinese Language; Com Skls=Communication Skills; Hist/Port=History of Portugal; K=Kindergarten; Lang Arts=Language Arts; Lang Dev=Language Development; M-A Cult=Mexican-American Culture; Mus=Music; P=Preschool; Rdng=Reading; Sp Hmts=Spanish Humanities; Sp Lang=Spanish Language; SS=Social Studies; W Geo=World Geography

PROGRAM	Grade	Bilingual Subjects	Subjects in E	Subjects in X	% time in E
1. Barstow	K	all			60
2. Brentwood	3-4	other		Sp Lang	20-90
3. Calexico	7-9	SS	ESL	Sp Lang	
4. Chula Vista	K-3	SS	ESL	Sp Lang	
	4-7	SS, Math	ESL		
	10	SS, W Geo		M-A Cult	
5. Compton	K-1	other	ESL		20-25
6. El Monte	K	all			50
7. Fresno City	K-1		other	Sp Lang	90
8. Fresno County	K-1	other	ESL, Math Lang Dev	Sp Lang	70
9. Hawaiian Gardens	K-6	Lang Arts Math			85
	7-12	Hist/Port			85
10. Healdsburg	1	other	Rdng	Art, Mus	70
11. La Puente	K-3	other	Rdng	Sp Lang	90
12. Los Nietos	P	all			60
13. Marysville	K-5	other	ESL		20-?
	6-8	other	ESL	Sp Lang	
14. Pomona	7-8	Com Skls			90
15. Redwood City	1	other	ESL	Sp Lang	50
16. Sacramento	P-2	other	ESL, Rdng	Sp Lang	50
17. St. Helena	9-12	Math	ESL	Com Skls Sp Hmts	
18. San Francisco	1	other	ESL	Ch Lang	?-100
19. Sanger	K-1	other	ESL, Lang Dev	Sp Lang	50-75
20. Santa Ana	P	all			50
21. Santa Barbara	K-3	other	ESL, Rdng		60-85
22. Santa Clara	P	all			0-50
23. Stockton	K-3	other	Math		66

school level. In fact, the programs in Hawaiian Gardens, Marysville, and Chula Vista also operate at the primary level and so, in a sense, can be considered as containing two bilingual programs. Since this was the first year of operation for most programs, grade levels usually span only one or two years, though the Hawaiian Gardens program includes all grades from K through 12. A number of the classes are actually ungraded, although this fact does not appear in the statistics. The bilingual class in Brentwood, for instance, consists of one class of students of third and fourth grade age levels.

Closely related to differences in grade level is the dichotomy of the pull-out vs. the self-contained bilingual program. With the exception of the Portuguese bilingual project in Hawaiian Gardens, all of the bilingual programs at the primary level are of the self-contained kind. In the self-contained program children remain in a single classroom while learning subjects in both English and X. In many of these programs the regular classroom teacher, with the assistance of the bilingual aide, has the responsibility for teaching subjects in both languages. However, in some of these programs (e.g. Sacramento, Stockton) a special teacher is sent in to give instruction in the bilingual or non-English subjects. In the pull-out system, the students are taken out of the regular English program and placed in the bilingual class under a special teacher for one or more periods a day. This type of program is much

more common in programs operating at the junior high and high school because of the separation of subjects at that level.

Perhaps the most crucial factor for the curriculum in a bilingual program concerns the use of languages in particular subject-matter areas. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to list the subjects taught bilingually, and those which were taught exclusively in either English or X. Those subjects outside of the bilingual component in a pull-out program were not considered. As shown in Table 3, the largest number of subjects in bilingual programs are being taught in both languages. Four programs affirmed that "all" of their subjects, and thirteen others that all subjects but one or two are bilingual. Significantly, all of these programs are operative at the early primary level. As a result of the pull-out system prevalent in the higher-level programs. usually only one or two subjects are presented bilingually in these programs. Social studies is the most popular subject taught in two languages, presumably because of its inherently bilingual-bicultural nature. Art and music are also favorite bilingual activities, since approximately half of the projects surveyed are conducting these subjects in both languages.

Turning to the subjects taught only in English as presented in Table 3, one finds that in most programs only a few such subjects are taught within the regular bilingual framework. The most frequently mentioned subject is ESL,

which is listed as a separate subject by twelve programs. Besides ESL, a distinct language development component in English makes up part of the curriculum in the programs in Sanger, Fresno City, and Fresno County. In these three programs, which utilize the materials develcped by Consultants in Total Education (CITE) of Los Angeles, and in the Stockton program, math instruction is also being given in English. During the interviews it became apparent that the programs where content subjects such as math or science are taught only in English feel that it is important to the child's future success that he learn such subjects in the language that would later become his main medium of instruction. In addition, reading is taught exclusively in English in four of the programs surveyed. The introduction of reading in English only has a special rationale: in this context both the interviewees in Sacramento and Healdsburg mentioned the need to introduce only one system of writing so as not to "confuse" the children, although these programs expect to introduce reading in Spanish at a later stage.

A certain number of subjects are also being taught through the medium of X only. Most of these subjects are related to the language itself: ten programs list "Spanish" (as a first, or a second language) as a separate subject. Similarly, the bilingual program in St. Helena offers a course entitled "Communication Skills" to develop the Spanish-speaking abilities of Mexican-American students. Certain courses dealing mainly with the culture of a partic-

ular language group are being given in that language (e.g. "Spanish Humanities" in St. Helena and "Mexican-American Culture" in Chula Vista), but just as often such courses are presented bilingually. The bilingual class in Healdsburg offers the only example where an attempt has been made to teach art and music exclusively in the non-English language. In this program the plan was to use primarily English in the content areas and Spanish in the "experience areas," that is, art, music, and recreation (Healdsburg Union Elementary School District, 1969, p. 11).

Leaving the problem of which subjects are taught in what languages, one comes to the question of the total amount of time devoted to each language in the curriculum. Many programs found it difficult to give exact figures for the amount of time devoted to either language, because the use of languages apparently varies from day to day and (in pull-out programs) from individual to individual, depending on the number of courses in which a student is enrolled. However, from an examination of the twenty programs which provided such data, it seems possible to distinguish three main types of programs. In a limited number of programs (Compton, Santa Clara, the early primary level in Marysville) the use of the non-English language predominates, with English averaging under 25% of the class time. Not surprisingly, these are programs which contain large numbers of monolingual X-speakers. The largest number of programs (12 out of 20) are those where the use of English

runs from 50-75% of class time. In the remaining group of programs (Hawaiian Gardens, Fresno City, Pomona, La Puente) the use of English predominates, taking over 85% of class time.

Another problem to be considered with questions of time has to do with the extent of shift from one language to another over the duration of a program. Among the twenty programs which gave figures for the use of languages in the curriculum, six programs noted an increase in the use of English. Programs of more than one grade level where the proportion of English has increased include those in Compton, Marysville, and Sanger. The figures for the Compton and Sanger programs cannot be considered truly developmental, since these programs were initiated in all grades simultaneously. On the other hand, figures from the one-year programs in Brentwood, Santa Clara, and San Francisco also indicate a high rate of shift from the native language over to English. In the Brentwood and Santa Clara programs, the extent of shift averaged respectively 70% and 50%. In the San Francisco program, the amount of Chinese used at the beginning of the program was not given but, according to the assistant coordinator of the program, a great deal of Chinese was used at the onset to give instructions and to teach concepts. The use of Chinese then gave way to English so that by the end of the year nearly all of the instruction was taking place in English (Al Yuen, personal interview).

In most programs which registered an increase in the amount of English used, the increase has been gradual and cumulative. The amount of English used in the Compton program, for example, increased from 20% to only 25%. Even among the programs which witnessed larger increases, the change was gradual and day-by-day. The bilingual program in Brentwood forms an exception to this general rule. In this project, the change was relatively abrupt--in the first semester most subjects were taught in Spanish, while in the second semester subjects were taught in English, though 1½ hours of Spanish language and reading were maintained (Fedro Yanez, personal interview).

IV.1. Methods and Materials

The foregoing survey of the curricula of bilingual programs left many questions concerning the organization of bilingual programs unanswered. For example, after examining a list of subjects taught in bilingual programs, one still needs to ask: just how are these subjects taught, and to what extent do bilingual schools vary in their application of methods? Bilingual schools, as other schools, may differ widely in over-all methodology, particularly with respect to the type of methodology to be followed in the early stages of learning. This issue is summed up by Andersson and Boyer as follows: "Stated in a greatly oversimplified way, some authorities stress freedom of play as the best avenue of learning, while others emphasize the economy of a highly structured approach, with teaching materials and procedures planned out in much detail" (1970, p. 104). The conflict over basic methodology is also reflected in a division of opinion over the extent to which a structured method should be used to teach second languages. Furthermore, one may find rather significant variations in the way bilingual subjects are taught in different schools, depending largely on the composition of the student group in the classroom. Teaching materials for the most part correspond to these differences in approach, but there are special problems in finding suitable materials for the bilingual program because of the frequent dearth of materials in the non-English language.

Looking first at the basic methodology of Title VII programs, one sees that there are some programs which appear to favor a highly structured approach to the teaching of most subject-matter. An example of this kind of program is the bilingual primary project in Stockton, which uses the Ott materials developed at Southwest Labroatories. According to the proposal for the project, the Stockton program revolves around five content areas which are structured so that "pupils move progressively through learning experiences sequences for gradual but systematic development of concepts and language" (Stockton Unified School District, 1969, p. 8). However, most programs apparently prefer a methodology which combines structured activities with periods of relatively unstructured learning. For instance, at Fresno County, one of the three programs implementing the CITE curriculum, the class schedule alternates between twenty minutes of intensive instruction, followed by twenty minutes of a self-selected activity. The classroom contains an English-speaking corner and a Spanish-speaking corner, where children may go of their own accord during the self-selection periods (Harriette Jowett, personal interview). Similarly, in the bilingual project in El Monte children engage for short periods in structured bilingual activiites, and then are allowed to work on self-initiated activities within one of a number of specifically designed behavioral settings (El Monte Elementary School District, 1970, p. 16).

There appears to be a wider variation among bilingual

programs when it comes to the question of methods for second-language teaching. In the teaching of ESL, in particular, one finds a fairly clear split between the advocates of a structured, linguistic method, and the proponents of a looser "experience" approach. Typical of the former are the programs in Compton and Stockton, which follow the audio-lingual method in developing skills in both English and Spanish. On the other hand, some programs object to the linguistic approach to language-learning. In the Healdsburg proposal one finds the following statement: "While the linguistic materials do offer the advantage of reflecting the natural structural forms of the children's language, they do not appear to develop language skills in relation to the total experiences of the child" (Healdsburg Union Elementary School District, 1969, p. 19). Therefore, this program prefers to emphasize a method dubbed the "language experience approach" that would attempt to develop the child's language skills as he is learning other subject matter. Other programs, particularly those functioning at the pre-first and first grade level, do not use a linguistic approach because they feel that children at this age are able to pick up the language without any special, structured instruction.

In discussing methodology it is also important to look at the different methods used in teaching bilingual subjects. In the use of languages, for example, one finds a variety of approaches depending on the composition of the

students in the classroom. In programs where there are a large number of monolingual X-speaking students, content subjects are usually presented in X, and later reinforced in English. Both the programs in Marysville and Compton, for example, began to teach reading and writing in Spanish, and literacy skills in English were not introduced until later in the program. In some programs with children of mixed language backgrounds, activities might be presented first in either language. An instance of this type of program is the preschool project in Santa Ana, where the teacher teaches counting, music, and story-telling in either Spanish or English at her own discretion (Benjamin Soria, personal interview). Where there are few if any monolingual X-speaking children in the program, subjects are more usually introduced in English, the other language being used to reinforce these concepts for X-speaking students. In La Puente, for example, Spanish is taught everyone as the bicultural element of the curriculum, but is used as a medium of instruction in content areas primarily to explain and develop concepts when Spanish-speaking children are having difficulty in grasping a subject in English (Frank Keohane, personal interview).

Differences among programs concerning methods in teaching bilingual subjects area also found on the issue of repetition: i.e., should the same lessons be presented in both languages? At least one program, the bilingual project in Stockton, makes extensive use of repetition. In

this program identical lessons are taught in English and Spanish, though not immediately following each other (Richard Valenzuela, personal interview). However, most programs find this method wasteful. According to the project proposal for the Sanger program, "Teaching the same subject matter twice, once in the native language and again in English, is generally unnecessary duplication violating the most important contribution of pedagogy, namely efficiency" (Sanger Unified School District, 1969, p. 9). In teaching bilingual subjects such as social studies, usually only the culturally appropriate language is used to teach a particular lesson. For less culturally-related bilingual subjects such as science or math, concepts are presented in either E or X, followed by reinforcement in the other language, but an attempt is usually made to avoid direct duplication.

In programs with children of mixed language backgrounds, differences in methods of teaching bilingual subjects as well as different approaches to language teaching require a greater or lesser degree of grouping within the classroom. In a number of programs X-speaking children are separated from the other students to undergo special instruction in content areas in their native language. In the La Puente program, for example, Mexican-American children receive special instruction in math, science, and other subjects in Spanish within small groups supervised by the bilingual aide. The most common type of grouping

occurs for purposes of reinforcement in the weaker language. In the programs in Sacramento, Redwood City, Healdsburg, Hawaiian Gardens, and elsewhere children are taken aside regularly for short periods for intensive instruction in the second language. However, not all mixed programs group children for language activities. At El Monte, Los Nietos, and Stockton, for example, there is no separation of students for specialized language learning.

Although bilingual programs would, naturally, tend to select materials which correspond to their particular approach, many programs have found it difficult to obtain suitable materials. The extent to which this is a problem varies widely among programs, depending on a given program's approach and the uses to which languages are put in teaching subject-matter. In programs where most of the instruction in content-matter is done in English, there is usually little difficulty with material, since the state-adopted texts are used for this purpose. Nor is the problem acute for a few programs such as the CITE and Stockton projects, which use materials that have been developed to cover almost the entire range of the curriculum. On the other hand, programs which emphasize teaching in the minority language have often found it next to impossible to obtain appropriate materials in that language.

In order to obviate the shortage of materials, a number of programs have attempted to use imported materials, or to translate English materials into the minority lan-

guage. The use of imported materials seems particularly appropriate in teaching the non-English language and culture. In the Brentwood, Fresno County, Healdsburg, and other programs, Spanish records and books are used to teach music and story-telling in that language. On the other hand, translated materials are often employed to teach such culturally neutral subjects as science and math. At Hawaiian Gardens, for example, state-adopted math books have been translated into Portuguese to aid Portuguese-speaking students in developing their math concepts. Some programs have made even more extensive use of translation. In both the Barstow and La Puente programs most Spanish materials have been translated from existing English materials. There seemed to be no particular need to develop special Spanish materials for the students in the La Puente project because it was thought their culture did not differ much from the Anglo culture (Frank Keohane, personal interview).

However, a few programs do not consider the use of translated or imported materials to be sufficient, and have attempted to devise their own materials in the non-English language. In many cases this type of material has been developed on a fairly ad-hoc basis. At Hawaiian Gardens, for example, the classroom teacher has been improvising her own text on language development, and at Redwood City the teacher has made up his own supplies for teaching social studies. In programs which possess a strong component in X, on the other hand, materials development in the minority

language is often an important activity. The outstanding example of this type of program is the Compton project where, according to the director, there is a strongly felt need to develop materials in all areas of the curriculum that reflect the culture and the dialect of Spanish spoken in the area. Already some 10% of the teaching materials have been developed by the program, and it is hoped that eventually all of the necessary materials will be produced there (Frank M. Goodman, personal interview).

IV.5. Teachers and Teacher Training

The question of what kind of teacher is best for a bilingual program has been much discussed in recent literature on bilingual education. To many writers it seems self-evident that the teacher of bilingual children must possess certain unique qualifications. The first requirement is language: for Gaarder, "the teachers should have native-like command of the language taught, with academic preparation and experience through that medium" (1967, p. 117), particularly for work beyond the first few grades of primary school. For others it is important that a teacher in a bilingual program be bicultural as well as bilingual "so that he may properly assess the cultural differences brought by the students from a variety of backgrounds" (Ulibarri, 1970, p. 19). On the other hand, Andersson and Boyer admit that "unilingual speakers of English are by no means unneeded in a bilingual program" (1970, p. 113). Much depends on the uses to which the teacher will be put. The program which tries an integrated approach will be more in need of bilingual teachers than the pull-out program where one or two teachers are responsible for the bilingual component. In this section those aspects of teachers and teacher-training will be looked at which reveal the varied approaches taken by different Title VII programs.

An important part of the study of teachers and teacher training concerned an examination of teacher qualifications. The first step was to determine how many teachers possessed

bilingual ability. In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate the numbers of bilingual teachers in their programs. Looking at the results as presented in Table 4, one finds that although 14 of the 23 programs indicate bilingual ability for all their teachers, still somewhat less than half of the total number of teachers are considered to possess this qualification. In all programs where only one teacher is engaged, that teacher is bilingual. Moreover, in those programs where there are large numbers of monolingual X-speaking children (e.g. Compton, Santa Clara) teachers tend to be bilingual rather than monolingual. Conversely, programs where the teachers are monolingual in English (e.g. La Puente, Sacramento, Stockton) tend to contain somewhat lower proportions of X-speaking children.

Further information concerning the language competencies of the teachers was solicited in both the questionnaire and the interviews. First, during the interviews an attempt was made to discover how many of the bilingual teachers are native speakers of the non-English language. Visits were not made to several of the programs with bilingual teachers (Chula Vista, Calexico, Barstow), but from information obtained from the other programs it appears that somewhat over half of the bilingual teachers (32 out of 56) speak X natively. The author also attempted to ascertain how many teachers have had training as second-language teachers. Referring again to Table 4, one finds that

TABLE 4: TEACHERS AND TEACHER TRAINING

PROGRAM	Total #/ t'chrs	#/ bil. t'chrs	#/teachers with specialized training				#/ bil. aides
			pre-ser.	in-ser.	ESL	XSL	
1. Barstow	8		8	8			8
2. Brentwood	1	1				1	
3. Calexico	6	6					5
4. Chula Vista	16	12	16	16			11
5. Compton	2	2		2	2	2	
6. El Monte	1	1	1				1
7. Fresno City	5	5	5	5			5
8. Fresno County	5	3	5	5		1	5
9. Hawaiian Gardens	2	2	1	2			4
10. Healdsburg	1	1	1				1
11. La Puente	30		30	30			65
12. Los Nietos	2	1		2			4
13. Marysville	6	3	6	6			6
14. Pomona	1	1					1
15. Redwood City	2	2	2	2	1	1	2
16. Sacramento	11	4		10			7
17. St Helena	1	1	1			1	1
18. San Francisco	1	1		1			1
19. Sanger	2	2	2	2		1	2
20. Santa Ana	3	3		3	1		8
21. Santa Barbara	3	3		3	1		7½
22. Santa Clara	11	11	11	11			
23. Stockton	25	7	24	24	—	—	9
Totals	145	72	106	132	4	7	144½

respondents indicated that only four of the teachers have had training as ESL teachers, while seven others have had experience or training in teaching X as a second or foreign language (XSL). Finally, interviewees were asked how many of the teachers have actually been trained through X as a medium of instruction. Although the figures here are also incomplete, it appears that only a handful of teachers have had such training.

Many programs acknowledged the need for supplemental training for their teachers by instituting pre- and in-service training sessions. The figures in Table 4 show that out of 145 teachers, 106 teachers participated in pre-service, and 132 in some form of in-service training. Both of these categories are somewhat loosely defined. For most programs, pre-service training consisted of a one- or two-week summer workshop during which members of the bilingual staff met to work out problems of rationale, methods, and materials. In other programs, teachers attended summer practice sessions of up to six weeks in duration, or boned up on their language skills at summer institutes. Activities in in-service sessions have been just as varied. In some programs in-service training has been simply a matter of regular consultation and planning between teachers and aides, while teachers of other programs (e.g. Compton, Marysville) have attended college-credit courses on methods in teaching ESL and bilingual education as part of their in-service training.

Beyond the questions of teacher background and training, there was the question of how teachers are being utilized in various bilingual programs. In this regard it was important to consider how many programs are following the one-classroom-one-teacher approach as opposed to using team teaching. Generally speaking, the one-teacher approach ties in with the self-contained classroom prevalent at the lower grade levels. In programs of this type, the regular classroom teacher usually has the responsibility of presenting the subjects in both languages. However, in some of the programs which use the self-contained classroom, a special teacher is sent in to give instruction in ESL, XSL, or bilingual subjects. The bilingual project in Sacramento, for example, employs a bilingual "resource" teacher who goes from class to class giving bilingual instruction in social studies and Spanish as a Second Language.

Team-teaching, on the other hand, is closely associated with the pull-out program where separate teachers are used to teach English and non-English (or bilingual) subjects. Still, in most pull-out programs the actual amount of teamwork involved is minimal, since there is usually little overlap in the subject matter taught by both teachers. At only one program has a situation been observed where a team of teachers actually have responsibility for developing and coordinating an entire curriculum. This is the first-grade project in Redwood City, where two teachers are involved in the program, one to teach the English component and the

other to teach the Spanish segment. The teacher of the English component has charge of teaching content subjects in English to E-speakers as well as to Spanish-speakers who are more advanced in their knowledge of English. The teacher of the Spanish component teaches Spanish as both a first and a second language, and gives instruction in the major bilingual component of the curriculum--social studies (Sabrina Cohen, personal interview).

Another important question to consider in this context was the extent to which bilingual programs utilize bilingual teacher aides. It appears that the services of bilingual aides are very widely used: Table 4 shows that the total number of bilingual teacher aides (144½) almost exactly equals the number of teachers (145). Only two programs (Santa Clara, Compton) do not utilize teacher aides. In most programs there is approximately one bilingual aide per classroom, whether or not the teachers themselves are bilingual. Sometimes aides are restricted to certain particular tasks: the bilingual aide in the Pomona project, for example, is used primarily to handle audio-visual equipment, and the function of the aide in St. Helena has been primarily to locate materials for the program and to tutor individual students. More usually, however, they are used as assistant teachers, and cooperate with the teacher to teach all phases of the curriculum.

In certain programs teacher aides play an especially vital role as the chief representatives of the non-English

language and culture. In the Barstow, La Puente, Sanger, and Fresno County programs an attempt has been made to associate one language (English) with the regular classroom teacher, and the other (Spanish) with the bilingual aide, even though the latter two programs contain bilingual teachers. Naturally, those programs where all the teachers are monolingual have had to place special reliance in the bilingual aides. An example of such a program is the bilingual project in La Puente, where there are two aides for every teacher. The aides at La Puente are recruited from the local Mexican-American population and consist of two groups: adult aides and high school aides. The adult aides teach the Spanish component of the program under the direction of the teacher, while the high school aides, who are chosen as potential drop-outs, serve as tutors to the children and as assistants on field trips (Frank Keohane, personal interview).

IV.6. Community Involvement

Much has been written and discussed about the need to involve the community in the bilingual program. For example, Theodore Andersson, in speaking of the Spanish-English bilingual program, stresses that in order to correct popular misconceptions about the nature of language and culture "the parents and indeed the whole community need to be brought into the program" (1965, p. 159). Certainly, the major focus of such action would involve the parents themselves, since they have the primary responsibility for the advancement of their children's knowledge. However, because public schools are responsible to a wider system including community taxpayers, it seems necessary to legitimize the program to the whole community. In this section an attempt will be made to examine the extent and type of community involvement at different Title VII bilingual programs.

The first step was to determine the means by which various programs are maintaining contact with parents. All of the programs in the survey indicated that they have made vigorous efforts to contact and to maintain communication with the parents. At four projects (Marysville, El Monte, Healdsburg, Pomona) parents first learned about the program by means of home visitations--that is, the teacher and sometimes the aide went to the homes of parents to explain the program, solicit the parents' reactions, etc. The Marysville project has continued the home visitations on

a regular basis because, according to Adan Rodriguez, "home visitations are the most efficient" means of involving parents (personal interview). Other programs have preferred to maintain contact with the parents by means of bilingual PTA meetings or by holding regularly scheduled meetings throughout the year. Because of a requirement under the BEA, all programs have taken steps to involve parental advisory groups in the program. These groups have assisted the project staff by drawing up objectives, disseminating information about the program to the neighborhood, and by making recommendations about how the program could be changed and improved.

Many programs have taken steps to involve parents more actively. Ten of the programs in the survey noted that they had made efforts to bring parents in to observe classes and even to take part in instructing the children. In El Monte, parents come in on a regular basis, and meet with the teacher twice a month in order to discuss what has happened in the classroom and to plan future activities. (Robert Rodriguez, personal interview). At the Stockton program a parental task force has been established to help teachers prepare materials, to distribute information to other parents, and to assist the school staff on field trips (Stockton Unified School District, 1969, p. 13). The Santa Clara project has perhaps gone furthest in involving parents directly in the academic program. In this preschool program, small groups of children are taught in individual

homes rather than in a classroom, and the mother listens while a lesson is being taught or takes part in the instruction. Once a week the home teacher speaks with the mother and advises her on the kinds of things she might do to help the child in areas he has difficulty with (Antonia Micotti, personal interview).

As part of their efforts to promote parental involvement, certain programs have attempted to assist parents in continuing their own education. This has been accomplished in various ways. In Marysville and Hawaiian Gardens, parents have been urged to attend nightschool classes in such subjects as ESL, vocational training, and American citizenship. Other programs have set up classes exclusively for parents of children in the program. In Sacramento, for example, a special class in conversational English was begun for non-English speaking parents, while in El Monte, the bilingual project carried out a cultural enrichment program that took parents on trips to see plays, musical productions, and programs at a local convention center (El Monte Elementary School District, 1970, pp. 8-9). Perhaps the Santa Ana project has offered the most outstanding program in parental education. In this program, parents come twice weekly to the city recreation center to hear bilingual lectures on such topics as health, nutrition, and consumer education (banking and credit), and to participate in English and sewing classes (Benjamin Soria, personal interview).

Besides the aspect of parental invclvement, it was important to consider the extent to which other members of the community have participated in bilingual programs. Local citizens have been invclved at various stages in the development of bilingual projects. In Chula Vista, Stockton, Sacramento, and San Francisco, community advisory groups were invited to assist in the writing of the original proposal. In some programs local organizations have been represented on Title VII bilingual advisory committees. In Compton, for example, the Bilingual Council contains representatives from four Mexican-American associations (MAPA, LULAC, Largo Center, Welfare Rights Organization), who participate in monthly meetings along with parents of children in the program. More frequently, however, members os such organizations are informed about the program but do not actually sit on the Advisory Group.

IV.7. Summary

The study of twenty-three of the twenty-six bilingual programs in California under the categories of objectives, participants, curriculum, methods and materials, teachers and teacher training, and community involvement shows the tremendous diversity among current bilingual programs. At the same time, these programs can be discussed or compared in terms of certain variables in each of these categories. The variables may be summarized as follows:

1. Objectives

a) goals for X-speaking students
b) goals for E-speaking students

2. Participants

a) language background
b) range of bilingualism
c) background in the community
d) family background

3. Curriculum

a) grade level
b) pull-out vs. self-contained
c) use of languages to teach subject-matter
d) time patterns
e) extent of shift
f) rate of shift

3. Methods and Materials

a) structured vs. unstructured
b) methods in teaching bilingual subjects
c) repetition
d) grouping
e) selection of materials

5. Teachers and Teacher Training

a) teacher qualifications
b) one teacher vs. team-teaching
c) use of bilingual aides

6. Community Involvement

a) involvement of parents
b) involvement of community

Some of these variables are more significant than others in distinguishing broad "types" of bilingual programs. Variables under the categories of objectives, participants, and curriculum seem most useful in this regard.

The study of objectives shows that programs can be divided into two groups on the basis of goals for X-speaking children: either assimilation into the dominant language and culture, or maintenance of the first language and culture. Also, bilingual programs can be distinguished into three types on the basis of the language background of their students: predominantly X-speaking, mixed, or predominantly E-speaking. The comparison of bilingual curricula shows a third basis for distinguishing broad categories of bilingual programs: the time devoted to each language in the curriculum. In this sense there are three types of programs which could be described as English-dominant, "balanced" (where both languages are used widely in the curriculum), and X-dominant.

In comparison, variables in the categories of mehods and materials, teachers and teacher training, or community involvement appear less significant in terms of making classifiable distinctions among bilingual programs. Although there appear to be some differences among bilingual programs over methodological points--such as the use of a structured or unstructureed method, or of repetition--and with regard to factors such as teacher qualifications, and the extent of parental involvement, it does not appear possible to classify programs into broad groups on this basis. Furthermore, certain variables in the last three categories seem to be related to more fundamental distinctions among variables in the first three categories. In

particular, variations in the methods of teaching bilingual subjects, grouping, the selection of materials, and even teacher qualifications depend to a large extent on differences in the language background of the students.

V. Conclusions

V.1. General Conclusions

What, then, does this study show about the meaning of bilingual education in the California context? In the light of the many factors involved in the discussion of bilingual education programs, it seems difficult to make any statements that would comprise a "definition" in the narrower sense of the term. Indeed, given the fact that not all programs are currently using language X to teach content matter, it does not even seem possible to say that bilingual education in California necessarily means "instruction in two languages." However, it does seem possible to draw some conclusions about trends in bilingual education based on the study of earlier and current programs. These generalizations about what bilingual education has "meant" in an empirical sense can then serve as a context for the consideration of a typology which will help to further chaacterize bilingual education in the state by distinguishing current programs into several clearly recognizable types.

First, it seems clear that bilingual education as originally conceived, ans as pursued in current programs, has been looked upon primarily as a means of meeting the educational needs of minority-language students. As has been shown, the first programs in the state arose out of the desire to find a solution to the pressing educational problems of Mexican-American children. Although at least

one of these early programs (Calexico) included Anglos in its student population, it is apparent that the chief interest of this and the other early programs was to help Spanish-speaking students who were having difficulty with the regular English curriculum. This emphasis was continued under Title VII, which, in its Declaration of Policy, specifically focussed on the need to help the "large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States." The policy is reflected in the fact that in most current programs X-speaking students are in the majority, consituting some 62% of the total enrollment.

A second, and related conclusion, is that the teaching of X-speakers in their native language remains the basic justification of bilingual education programs. Early programs emphasized the teaching of math, science, literature, and other content subjects in Spanish to Mexican-Americans whose lack of English hindered their learning of such subjects in English. Although current programs have been less consistent about the teaching of content subjects in X, their adherence to this basic principle is shown by the fact that these programs ranked Objective II (improved academic achievement by use of the mother tongue) far above all other objectives for X-speaking students. Even among those programs where minimal use is made of X in the curriculum, the teaching of X is apparently considered important as a means of achieving such intangible goals as the improvement of self-concept.

However, in spite of the importance in principle of the teaching of X, it seems that bilingual education in California, as a whole, can be characterized as showing signs of a shift toward English. Such a trend is not surprising in view of the fact that English remains the dominant language of the wider society. Evidence for this trend comes from an examination of both earlier programs and the present situation. Both the early Marysville and Calexico programs, for example, made plans to transfer their students to the regular program after they had acquired sufficient proficiency in English. Since Title VII programs have been provisionally scheduled to be funded for only five years, current programs recognize the need to prepare their children for an eventual transfer to an all-English program. The trend toward English among current programs seems confirmed by the fact that all programs of more than one year's duration, and many of the one-year programs have shown an increase in the amount of English used.

V.2. Classifying Current Programs

Although the study of Title VII programs showed the great diversity among current programs in the state, these programs could apparently be categorized into several broad "types" on the basis of certain of the variables observed. As noted, earlier typologies were based either on a comprehensive evaluation of linguistic variables (Mackey), or on variations in societal objectives (Fishamn), student background (Michel), or on organizational characteristics in the curriculum (Gaarder, Ulibarri). Mackey's typology included the study of variables that went considerably beyond the limits of this study, so no attempt will be made here to classify bilingual programs in terms of his wider typology. However, since the latter three considerations appear to parallel the categories in this study which showed significant distinctions among bilingual programs (objectives, participants, curriculum), it seems appropriate to discuss the possibility of a systematic typology based on one of these three variables.

A typology based primarily on objectives (societal or otherwise) would entail certain great difficulties with reference to Title VII programs in California. First, the study of objectives showed the general confusion over the issue among current Title VII programs. Although programs could be distinguished into two main groups on the basis of two objectives for X-speaking children, this distinction is clearly too broad to form the basis of a meaningful

typology. As noted in the section on curriculum, some programs have indeed shown short-term increases in the use of English, while others have shown no such increase. However, considering the fact that most programs have been in operation only one year, no long-term goals of language shift or language maintenance are predictable on such a basis.

A typology of Title VII programs based primarily on differences in student background seems similarly problematic. First, it is clear that bilingual programs in California cannot be divided, as in Michel's model, into three groups according to the monolingualism or bilingualism in the student population. Rather, it appears that although there are certain programs with high concentrations of monolingual X-speaking students, children in most programs evidence a wide range of mono- vs. bilingualism. It does seem possible to divide bilingual programs into three groups based on the proportions of E- and X-speakers in the student population (predominantly E-speaking, mixed, predominantly X-speaking). On the other hand, it is evident that a typology constructed on this basis would not account for other major differences among Title VII programs. In this context one need only consider the differences in the use of languages among programs which contain 100% X-speakers.

In comparison with possible typologies based on objectives or student background, a typology based largely on

organizaticnal factcrs in the curriculum would seem to hold certain distinct advantages in the descripticn of Title VII prcgrams. Cne finds, first cf all, that current prcgrams can readily be distinguished according to curricular variables identified in fcrmer typologies such as the time allowed each language, and the treatment and use of each language. Equally important, however, is the fact that a typolcgy which deals with a variety cf factcrs in the curriculum allows for a mcre sophisticated treatment of Title VII prcgrams than a breakdown according to only two objectives or three types of student background. Using the criteria given in Mackey's description of bilingual curriculua, it seems that Title VII programs might be categorized with reference to one of the four types: 1) Single-Medium Accultural Transfer (SAT), where X is taught as a subject but not used as a medium of instruction; 2) Dual-Medium Differential Maintenance (DDM), in which two languages are used to teach different subject-matter areas; 3) Dual-Medium Accultural Transfer (DAT), which is similar to DDM, except that these programs witness a shift toward the dominant language; and 4) Dual-Medium Equal Maintenance (DEM), where an attempt is being made to maintain the use of bcth languages in all areas of the curriculum.

There remain, however, several difficulties with a direct application cf a typology such as Mackey's to a description of Title VII programs. The first one lies with the problem of dealing with the factor of language shift.

In Mackey's typology this factor plays an important role in distinguishing bilingual programs. However, given the short duration of current programs, it would be misleading to ascribe too much importance to this factor in differentiating current programs. Considering the over-all tendency toward language shift, programs which have shown no apparent shift in the use of languages over a one-year period may well demonstrate this tendency in the near future. In addition, both the study of previous typologies and of current programs showed the interconnection of curricular variables with other aspects of the program. Thus a typology based entirely on curricular variables is bound to be incomplete.

Based on these considerations, a typology is proposed which is based mainly on relatively static factors in the curriculum, such as the extent of language use and the teaching of subject matter, but which also includes variables in student background and objectives where these appear to be relevant. Like Fishman's, this typology consists of four broad types of bilingual programs. Rather than representing different kinds of objectives, however, each type represents a different level of language use, ranging from maximum use of English (E) to maximum use of the non-English language (X). Each type will be illustrated with the appropriate examples from California Title VII programs.

Type I: English-dominant

In this type of program, which usually contains few if any monolingual X-speaking children, the underlying characteristic is the overwhelming predominance of English in the curriculum. Although such programs may make use of X for certain limited purposes, in no case is systematic use made of X to teach content subjects. Examples of this type of program include the Fresno City, Pomona, and La Puente projects. In the Fresno City and Pomona programs, Spanish is taught as a subject but is not used as a medium of instruction. In the La Puente program, Spanish is occasionally used to help X-speaking students with content material, but no subjects are taught consistently through that language.

Type II: Partial Bilingual

In the partial bilingual program English remains the major language of instruction, but X is used to teach certain curricular areas other than the language itself, most often those having to do with the history and culture of the non-English language. Such programs generally contain children of bilingual X-speaking or mixed language backgrounds and operate on a pull-out basis. Projects which fit this description include the programs in Chula Vista, Calexico, St. Helena, and Hawaiian Gardens. Although the Sanger and Fresno County programs do not work on a pull-out system, these programs can be considered "partial bilingual" to the extent that English remains the

exclusive medium of instruction in major curricular areas (language development, math).

Type III: Full Bilingual

This type of program contains children of mixed language background who are usually grouped together in a self-contained classroom. In these programs there is a fairly even balance in the use of languages (though English may be used somewhat more extensively) and children of both backgrounds learn most subjects bilingually. These programs tend to operate at the early primary level from preschool through grade one. A list of programs in this category would include the projects in Barstow, El Monte, Healdsburg, Sacramento, Stockton, Los Nietos, and Santa Ana.

Type IV: Non-English (X)-dominant

This type of program is composed largely of monolingual X-speakers and very extensive use is made of the non-English language. In fact, predominant use is made of X to teach major subject areas such as math, reading, and science. Although these programs may show signs of a shift over to English, their most likely objective is to "improve the academic achievement of the students through use of the mother tongue." The Compton, Santa Clara, and early primary-level program in Marysville are all examples of this type.

Such a typology, while it appears to offer the best means of classifying current programs, must remain sugges-

tive. Certainly there are programs which remain difficult to classify according to one of the four types described. Since programs are classified mainly in terms of static variables in the curriculum, it is particularly difficult to categorize programs such as San Francisco and Brentwood which have shown a great increase in the amount of English used. Although in the end result such programs can be treated as English-dominant, one must remember that at the beginning these programs used a great deal of X to teach content subjects. Other programs which are difficult to classify in terms of the model typology are the Redwood City and Santa Barbara programs. The Redwood City project might be described as "full bilingual" to the extent that both languages are used throughout the curriculum on an equal basis. However, it seems that much greater use of Spanish is being made to teach content subjects to Mexican-Americans than to Anglos. One finds a different situation in Santa Barabra, where the use of Spanish is much more limited with respect to time, but all content subjects are being taught to Spanish-speakers in that language. Thus it is difficult to determine whether this program should be classified as "partial" or "full" bilingual.

V.3. Implications of the Study

The present study of bilingual education in California, in spite of (or perhaps in large part because of) its highly tentative and provisional nature, suggests a number of implications for the future study of the phenomenon of bilingual education and even for the evaluation of future programs. The first, and most obvious implication is that bilingual education (even bilingual education in such a limited space and time) is such a multi-faceted subject that it needs to be studied in greater depth in its individual aspects before any further attempt can be made to evaluate the meaning of bilingual education of a broad scale. The conclusions in the present study concerning earlier and present programs did point to certain indications of how bilingual education in California could be generally characterized (i.e. emphasis on teaching X-speaking children, importance of X, shift toward English). However, it seems that perhpas more incisive and definitive statements could be made from an in-depth comparison of bilingual programs in the area of curriculum alone, or perhaps from a comparison of curricular factors and objectives in a given group of programs.

Other more specific implications stem from an examintion of the present typology. One of these concerns the interconnection of factors in pupil background and curriculum. It seems natural that a program which contains a large number of monolingual English speakers would tend

to be English-dominant in its curriculum, and, by the same token, a program containing many monolingual X-speakers would tend to be X-dominant. Nevertheless, this is not always the case, as witnessed by the classification of the San Francisco program (which contained exclusively monolingual X-speakers at the beginning of the year) as E-dominant. Such a conflict would indicate the eventual importance of the factor of language shift in the classification of bilingual programs. In a larger sense, however, it seems to call for a closer study of the correspondence between the factor of language background and curriculum patterns in order to determine the extent to which this correspondence is significant.

Perhaps the most important implication of the study, and one that has significance for the evaluation of bilingual programs, arises from the fact that there seemed to be so little overlap among current programs between factors in the curriculum and stated objectives. Only in the last category (X-dominant) did there seem to be some agreement, since two out of three programs in this category ranked Objective II (academic achievement by use of the mother tongue) as their first objective for X-speakers. Even here, the significance of this correspondence is diminished by the fact that this remained the most popular objective overall. On the other hand, one might expect that programs which were E-dominant in their curricula would tend to favor Objective I (mastery of English). However, the La

Puente program (the only project in this group from which data on objectives was obtained) ranked this objective fourth among the five objectives for X-speakers. Nor was there any correspondence between stated objectives and curricular factors for the second and third types of program, although "full" bilingual programs tended to rank Objective IV for X-speakers (bilingualism-biculturalism) higher than did the other types of programs.

The discrepancy between objectives and curriculum does not necessarily imply a direct judgment of programs in terms of their performance. Indeed, given the extensive resources made available under Title VII and the enthusiasm of both teachers and administrators (which was generally observed at these programs), it seems that most programs are obtaining very favorable results as regards both pupil performance and community acceptance. Still, the discrepancy does indicate that programs may not be as successful as they wish in terms of coordinating their aims and the means which they use to achieve those aims. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss problems that deal directly with evaluation, it does seem appropriate to suggest that a program can only be successful in the light of the objectives that it sets for itself. It appears, then, that in view of the lack of consensus over what bilingual education really means, that future sponsors of bilingual programs will need to do some serious thinking about what bilingual education means to them, and how this con-

cept can best be realized in the framework of a total program.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Andersson, Theodore. "Bilingual Elementary Schooling: A Report to Texas Educators." The Florida FL Reporter, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Summer, 1969), pp. 37-40.

Andersson, Theodore, and Boyer, Mildred. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. Two Vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

Baca, Fidel Garcia. Bilingual Education in Certain Southwest School Districts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Utah, 1956.

Calexico Unified School District. Bilingual Education in Grades 7, 8, and 9. ERIC No. ES 001 675, 1967.

Calexico Union High School. Curriculum Improvement Proposal: Bilingual Education in Grades 7, 8, and 9. ERIC No. ES 000 330, 1966.

California State Department of Education. Administrative Procedures for the Bilingual Education Act. Sacramento, Calif., 1968a.

_____. Annual Report, 1965-66: Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in California Public Schools. Sacramento, Calif.: Office of Compensatory Education, 1967a.

_____. Annual Report, 1966-67: Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in California Public Schools. Sacramento, Calif.: Office of Compensatory Education, 1968b.

_____. Assessment of Rural Mexican-American Pupils, Preschool and Grades 1-12 (Wasco, Calif.). Sacramento, Calif., 1968c.

_____. Conference on Understanding and Teaching Mexican-American Children and Youth (Oxnard, Calif., Oct. 16-17, 1964). Sacramento, Calif., 1964a.

_____. Curriculum Improvement Proposal: A Proposal to Develop Guides for Teaching English as a Second Language to Elementary School Pupils. Sacramento, Calif., 1964b.

_____. Orange County Conference on the Education of Spanish-Speaking Children and Youth (Garden Grove, Calif., Feb. 14-15, 1964). Sacramento, Calif., 1964c.

_____. Nuevas Vistas: A Report of the Annual Conference of the California State Department of Education (Los Angeles, Calif., April 13-14, 1967). ERIC No. ED 020 844, 1968d.

_____. Progress Report on Compensatory Education Programs in California. Sacramento, Calif.: Advisory Committee on Compensatory Education, 1965.

_____. Prospectus for Equitable Educational Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking Children. Sacramento, Calif.: Mexican American Education Research Project, 1967b.

_____. Teacher's Guide to the Education of Spanish-Speaking Children. Sacramento, Calif., 1952.

Carter, Thomas P. Mexican-Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Christian, Chester A. "Suggested Objectives for a Bilingual Program." In: Stubing, Charles, ed., Bilingualism: Reports (Third Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, Nov. 4-5, 1966), pp. 31-32.

Cooke, Henry W. "The Segregation of Mexican-American School Children in Southern California." School and Society, Vol. 67, June 1948, pp. 417-421.

El Monte Elementary School District. Application for Continuation: Bilingual Education Program. El Monte, Calif., 1970.

Fishman, Joshua A. Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective. Unpublished paper prepared for the 1970 TESOL Conference (March 20-29, San Francisco, Calif.).

_____. Language Loyalty in the United States. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1966.

Gaarder, A. Bruce. "Organization of the Bilingual School." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April, 1967), pp. 110-120.

_____, et al. "Bilingualism: From the Viewpoint of Administrator and Counselor." In: Stubing, Charles, ed., Bilingualism: Reports (Third Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, Nov. 4-5, 1966), pp. 9-23.

Glick, Lawrence B. "The Right to Equal Opportunity." In: Samora, Julian, ed., La Raza: Forgotten Americans (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), pp. 95-124.

Gonsalves, Julia. "Bilingual Education in California." In: Christian, Chester A., ed., Reports: Bilingual Education, Research and Teaching (Fourth Annual Conference of the Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, Nov. 10-11, 1967), pp. 62-65.

Haugen, Einar. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. University, Ala.: The University of Alabama Press, 1968.

Healdsburg Union Elementary School District. Formal Project Application: Bilingual Education Spanish-English. Healdsburg, Calif., 1969.

Mackey, William F. "A Typology of Bilingual Education." In: Andersson and Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Vol. 2, pp. 63-83.

Manuel, Herschel T. The Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare. Austin, Tex.: The University of Texas Press, 1965.

Michel, Joseph. "Tentative Guidelines for a Bilingual Curriculum." The Florida FL Reporter, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Fall, 1967), pp. 13, 16.

National Education Association. The Invisible Minority: Report of the NEA-Tuscon Survey on the Teaching of Spanish for the Spanish-Speaking. Washington, D.C., 1966.

Palomares, Uvaldo, and Cummins, Emery J. Assessment of Rural Mexican-American Pupils in Preschool and Grades One Through Six (San Ysidro, Calif.). ERIC No. ED 017 959, 1967.

Phillips, L.H. "Segregation in Education: A California Case Study." Phylon, Vol. 10 (1949), pp. 407-413.

Plakos, John. Mexican American Research Project: Progress Report. ERIC No. ED 018 281, 1967.

Rodriguez, Armando. The Realities of Bilingual Education. ERIC No. ED 033 256, 1969.

Sanger Unified School District. Formal Project Application: Instructional Program in Bilingual Education. Sanger, Calif., 1969.

Saville, Muriel P., and Troike, Rudolf. A Handbook of Bilingual Education. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1970.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1956.

Stockton Unified School District. Formal Project Application: A Demonstration Bilingual Education Project. Stockton, Calif., 1969.

Sweetwater Union High School District. Formal Project Application: Project Frontier. Chula Vista, Calif., 1969.

Thonis, Eleanor. Bilingual Education for Mexican-American Children: Report of an Experiment Conducted in the Marysville Joint Unified School District. Sacramento, Calif.: California State Department of Education, 1967.

Ulibarri, Horatio. Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educators. ERIC No. ED 038 078, 1970.

UNESCO. Report on International Seminar on Bilingualism in Education (Aberystwyth, Wales). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1965.

U.S. House of Representatives. Bilingual Education Programs: Hearings Before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor (Ninetieth Congress, First Session, on H.R. 9840 and H.R. 10224).

U.S. Office of Education. Mexican-American Education: A Special Report. ERIC No. ED 023 510, 1968.

U.S. Senate. Bilingual Education: Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Ninetieth Congress, First Session, on S.428). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printin Office, 1967.

Valencia, Atilano. Bilingual/Bicultural Education: A Prospective Model in Multicultural America. ERIC No. ED 028 017, 1969

Weinreich, Uriel. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1968

Zintz, Miles V. What Classroom Teachers Should Know About Bilingual Education. ERIC No. ED 028 427, 1969.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Cover Letter

March 1, 1970

Dear Mr. (Administrator):

With the establishment of many new bilingual programs under Title VII, it becomes a matter of considerable interest and importance to gather information concerning the various types of programs currently in operation. This is what I propose to do as part of the research for my M.A. thesis in Teaching English as a Second Language at UCLA. I would very much appreciate your taking the time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire which will give the data required. If any materials are available which discuss your bilingual program, please mail them when you return the questionnaire.

Upon completion of the study, a summary of the findings will be sent at your request. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

(Tay Lesley)

Appendix B: Questionnaire

I. PARTICIPANTS

1. Total number of pupils in your bilingual program_____ of whom_____are native Spanish speakers and_____ are native English speakers. Other language group represented (if any)_____and number of pupils in that group_____.

2. How many pupils are involved in the bilingual program at each level? (Indicate number of pupils)

P K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

3. Are native and non-native English speakers mixed at different levels of the program? (yes or no) If so, at what levels are they mixed? (Circle level)

P K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

II. OBJECTIVES

A. What are the most important objectives of your bilingual program for non-English speaking pupils? (Indicate order of importance by placing the numbers 1-6 in the blanks to the left)

___ 1. To enable the students to gain a functional mastery of English.

___ 2. To improve the academic achievement of the students by using the mother tongue to further concept development.

___ 3. To promote the students' feelings of dignity and self-worth by emphasizing the value of the native culture.

___ 4. To enable the students to develop a bilingual, bicultural world view.

___ 5. To help the students achieve maximum success in adapting to the dominant society.

___ 6. Other (Please specify)_____

_____

B. What are the most important objectives for your English-speaking children? (If applicable, rank the objectives as above)

___ 1. To enable the students to gain a mastery of the second language without detriment to their learning in English.

___ 2. To cultivate in the students an understanding and appreciation of the second culture.

___ 3. To develop in the students an impartial attitude toward their own and the second culture and language.

___ 4. Other (Please specify)_____

_____

III. CURRICULUM AND MATERIALS

1. What subjects in the program are taught in both English and the other language(s)? (Indicate subject and grade level)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. What subjects are taught entirely in English? (Subject and grade level)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. What subjects are taught exclusively in the other language? (Subject and grade level)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Approximately what percentage of classroom time is English used as the language of instruction at each level?

P	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%	___%

5. Are specially prepared or translated materials being used in your bilingual classes? (yes or no) If so, for what subjects and at what levels?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Are you using materials prepared in a foreign country for classes taught in the non-English language? (yes or no) If so, list examples of such materials and indicate levels at which they are used.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

IV. TEACHER TRAINING

1. Total number of teachers in bilingual program_____, of whom_____have competency in both languages.

2. Are bilingual teacher aides being used in your program? If so, how many and for what purposes?

_____

_____

3. How many of the teachers have had specialized training in the education of bilingual children? (Indicate the number of teachers involved in each type of training, e.g. pre- or in-service workshops, Teaching English as a Second Language, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

1. Are parents of non-English speaking children involved in the academic program at any level? If so, how many are involved and in what capacity?

_____

2. Have any special organizations been formed to ensure communication between school and community? (yes or no)

3. Do teachers meet with parents of non-English speaking pupils on a regular basis? (yes or no) If so, how often do such meetings take place and approximately how many parents attend?

_____

4. Have you witnessed any increase in parental interest for furthering their own education as a result of the program? (yes or no)

VI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
Please use this page to make any additional remarks you wish.

Appendix C: Interview Questions

1. What is the background of your students, and on what basis were they selected for the program?

2. What are the most important objectives of the program for: 1) non-English speaking students; 2) English-speaking students?

3. What language do the children first learn to read? Do they become literate in both languages?

4. What languages are used to teach "major" content areas (e.g. math, science, and social studies) and which are used to teach "minor" content areas (e.g. art, music, P.E.)?

5. What is the distribution of the laguages over the weekly schedule, and over the duration of the curriculum?

6. If your program is a mixed one, are English-speaking and non-English speaking pupils separated for different activities? If so, what activities?

7. What kinds of materials (standard or non-standard) are used in your program?

8. To what extent are bilingual teachers and teacher aides utilized in your program?

9. What kind of specialized training have your teachers had?

10. To what extent have parents become involved in the program? (What organizations have been formed to ensure communication between school and community; what special classes have been set up for parents of non-English speaking children?)

11. What particular successes or problems have you had with the program?

12. Do you envision any changes for the future?

Appendix D: Interviews

Interviewee	Title	Program	Address	Date
1. Acosta, Charles J.	Project Director	Hawaiian Gardens	21815 S. Norwalk Blvd. Hawaiian Gardens 90715	4/16/70
2. Allison, Harry	Project Director	Fresno City	3132 E. Fairmont St. Fresno 93421	5/11/70
3. Carter, Shelly	Teacher	St. Helena	473 Main St. St. Helena 94574	3/31/70
4. Cohen, Sabrina	Curriculum Writer	Redwood City	400 Duane St. Redwood City 94062	3/30/70
5. Flores, Susan	Project Director	Santa Barbara	4400 Cathedral Oaks Rd. Santa Barbara 93105	5/21/70
6. Goodman, Frank M.	Project Director	Compton	2508 E. 133rd. St. Compton 90220	4/24/70
7. Grijalva, Leo	Project Director	Los Nietos	11120 Broaded St. Santa Fe Springs 90670	4/17/70
8. Holland, Richard	Project Director	Sacramento	2930 21st Ave. Sacramento 95820	4/1/70
9. Jowett, Harriette	Project Director	Fresno County	2314 Mariposa Fresno 93721	5/1/70
10. Kately, John	Project Director	Healdsburg	304 Center St. Healdsburg 95448	3/31/70
11. Keohane, Frank W.	Project Director	La Puente	15959 E. Gale Ave. La Puente 91745	3/30/70

Appendix D: (Cont'd)

Interviewee	Title	Program	Address	Date
12. Micotti, Antonia	Project Director	Santa Clara	45 Santa Teresa St. San Jose 95110	3/30/70
13. Perez, Donald Jr.	Project Director	Sanger	1801 7th St. Sanger 93657	4/11/70
14. Rodriguez, Adan	Project Coordinator	Marysville	11th and Powerline Rd. Olivehurst 95901	4/1/70
15. Rodriguez, Robert	Project Director	El Monte	4020 Gibson Rd. El Monte 91731	4/16/70
16. Soria, Benjamin	Project Director	Santa Ana	1405 French St. Santa Ana 92701	5/21/70
17. Taylor, Ralph	Audio-Visual Coordinator	Pomona	800 S. Garey Ave. Pomona 97760	9/24/70
18. Valenzuela, Richard	Project Director	Stockton	701 N. Madison St. Stockton 95202	4/2/70
19. Yanez, Fedro	Project Director	Brentwood	929 Second St. Brentwood 94513	4/2/70
20. Young, Susan	Teacher	Healdsburg	304 Center St. Healdsburg 95448	3/31/70
21. Yuen, Al	Project Coordinator	San Francisco	950 Clay St. San Francisco 94108	3/30/70